

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
MAR 31 1954

CONTENTS

PERIODICAL READING ROOM

ROBBINS, ROSELL HOPE—A Late Fifteenth-Century Love Lyric	153
BOWERS, R. H.—A Middle-English Diatribe Against Backbiting	160
O'DONNELL, NORBERT F.—A Lost Jacobean 'Phoenissae'?	163
GILBERT, ALLAN—The Eavesdroppers in Jonson's 'Sejanus'	164
MCLEOD, A. L.—Nathaniel Lee's Birth Date	167
KALLICH, MARTIN—The Association of Ideas in Samuel Johnson's Criticism	170
MARKEN, JACK W.—The Canon and Chronology of William Godwin's Early Works	176
NITZE, W. A.—Conjointure in 'Erec' VS. 14	180
WALKER, HALLAM—The Source of a Balzac Work	182
LAPP, JOHN C.—Anouilh's 'Médée': A Debt to Seneca	183
WOODBRIDGE, BENJAMIN M., JR.—Sir Thomas Browne, Lamb, and Machado de Assis	188
MAUTNER, FRANZ H.—Zu Lichtenberg und Archenholz	189

REVIEWS:

THOMAS A. KNOTT and DAVID C. FOWLER (eds.), <i>Piers the Plowman</i> [Norman E. Eliason]	191
MARGARET L. WILEY, <i>The Subtle Knot</i> [Jackson I. Cope]	192
J. E. CONGLETON, <i>Theories of Pastoral Poetry in England, 1684-1798</i> [Edward A. Bloom]	197
C. L. CLINE, Byron, Shelley and their Pisan Circle [Kenneth Neill Cameron]	200
RICHMOND P. BOND, Queen Anne's American Kings [Roy Harvey Pearce]	201
EDGAR FINLEY SHANNON, JR., Tennyson and the Reviewers [Bradford A. Booth]	203
GORDON N. RAY, <i>The Buried Life. A Study of the Relation Between Thackeray's Fiction and His Personal History</i> [James L. Harlan]	205
JOHNSON, E. D. H., <i>The Alien Vision of Victorian Poetry</i> [Joseph Warren Beach]	206
JOHN W. DODDS, <i>The Age of Paradox: A Biography of England 1841-1851.</i> [George H. Ford]	209
CHARLES I. GLICKSBERG, <i>American Literary Criticism, 1900-1950</i> [Hyatt H. Waggoner]	211
HENRY LÜDEKE, <i>Geschichte der Amerikanischen Literatur</i> [Clarence Gohdes]	213
LEON HOWARD, <i>Victorian Knight Errant. A Study of the Early Literary Career of James Russell Lowell</i> [Harry Hayden Clark]	214
JAMES L. WOODRESS, <i>Howells and Italy</i> [Robert P. Falk]	215
WILLIAM J. ROACH, <i>The Continuations of the Old French "Perceval" of Chrétien de Troyes, Vol. III, Part 1: The First Continuation-Redaction of Ms. ALPRS</i> [Edward B. Ham]	217
PIERRE MÉLÈSE, <i>Théâtre de Racine</i> [H. C. Lancaster]	220
W. D. WILLIAMS, <i>Nietzsche and the French. A Study of the Influence of Nietzsche's French Reading on his Thought and Writing</i> [William H. McClain]	222
WILLIAM L. FICHTER, <i>Publicaciones periodísticas de don Ramón del Valle-Inclán anteriores a 1895</i> [Bruce W. Wardropper]	225
KARL VIÉTOR, <i>Geist und Form</i> [Ernst Feise]	227
BRIEF MENTION: REIDAR MYHRE, <i>Vokalismen i Iddemalet</i> ; RALPH M. WARDLE, <i>Mary Wollstonecraft: A Critical Biography</i> ; BERNARD GAGNEBIN, <i>Voltaire. Lettres inédites à son imprimeur Gabriel Cramer</i>	229

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October ·inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
KEMP MALONE
ARNO SCHIROKAUER

DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. D. Havens, E. Malakis,
L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price is \$6.00 in the U. S.; \$6.25 in Canada; and
\$6.50 in other foreign countries. The price of single issues is \$1.00.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.



Perfect Your FRENCH ... in this natural French setting at McGILL UNIVERSITY FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL

MONTREAL — JUNE 29 to AUGUST 10, 1954

This long-established popular school provides an ideal opportunity for study of the French language in an attractive vacation atmosphere: a conversational, residential course for teachers, students and business people, and for advanced students aiming at graduate work at McGill. French alone spoken at all times in residence. Tuition of unusually high standards by experienced French university teachers.

VISITING PROFESSOR, DR. LUCIEN WOLFF, RECTEUR HONOR-AIRE DE L'UNIVERSITE DE RENNES (FRANCE). Coeducational. Luxurious accommodation in beautiful Douglas Hall, interesting social activities, music and dramatics.

Fee (board, residence and tuition) \$285. (Canadian)
(Tuition only, \$135.)

Write today for prospectus to: DIRECTOR, FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL,
JEAN L. LAUNAY, Chairman of the Dept. of Romance Languages,

McGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL, CANADA

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1108
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

dition
on the
script
articles
o the
es of
Quo
, not
MP,
ditions
iness

editors
on the
script
articles
o the
ea of
Quo-
3, not
MP.
editors
siness

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXIX

MARCH, 1954

Number 3

A LATE FIFTEENTH-CENTURY LOVE LYRIC

The number of unpublished Middle English lyrics is decreasing every year; and now, presuming that no new MSS. will be found, only the waifs of the literary world remain to see print. Naturally, the value of such fugitive pieces is slight, and it is primarily to complete the corpus of texts that the following example is offered. "Thoythis fre þat lykis me" is a late fifteenth-century love lyric of twelve quatrains, written as prose on the end flyleaves of an early fifteenth-century copy of a *Pricke of Conscience*, MS 157 (D. 4. 11) of Trinity College, Dublin.¹ The pages are torn and stained, and the handwriting is faded.² The poem's dialect is Northern, or perhaps Scottish, and it provides a few words appearing earlier than the illustrations in the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Typical features, manner of preservation, and use of conventional clichés will be noted later.

Although there are but 48 lines of text, there exist ample characterizations of Northern dialect, with only two possible exceptions: the customary preservation of OE ā does not appear in *ston* 2 (rhyming with *mane* 4), and the verbal noun *sleyng* 19 (slaying = slaughter) shows a Southern inflexion. Northern indications, however, include: (1) the spellings *qw* (*qwar* 2, 13; *qwat* 3; *qwen* 14,

¹ Not listed in Carleton Brown and Rossell Hope Robbins, *The Index of Middle English Verse*, New York, 1943. The MS. is noted in *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, Fourth Report, p. 595; and by T. K. Abbott, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts*, Dublin, 1900, p. 20.

² On the flyleaves are many lines erased by scraping, and a number of surviving single words now almost illegible (*Clyme he cla . . . , delig . . . ,*

32; *qwy* 20); (2) forms of the present indicative in -is^a (pr. 3. s. *stekis* 15, *luffis* 35, 37; pr. 2. pl. *changgis* 31; pr. 3. pl. *lykis* 1; also *bou ys* 17, 19); (3) the present participle in -and (*leffand* 4); (4) the levelling of preterite singular and plural to one form, *was* (*ze and I was met* 21); (5) demonstrative pronoun *þer* 41; (6) original OE ā retained (*fra* 11, *sare* 15, *fa* 18, *bayth* 24); (7) OE o raised and rounded to Sc u (*gud* 8, 40; *tuk* 12, *gudle* 25, *luk* 28); (8) the presence of particularly Northern or Scottish words (*can* 5, *ipan* 36, *ponde* 26, *say* 20, *sle* 19).

wyll). In addition, there appears on the verso some Latin words in an earlier hand:

Qui penes finem spectauit iustificari	hic versus
vix saluus erit	
Vltimo digna dei licet veniat pede lento	
Nam si forte venit Ictu feriet violento	Canticum
Dicentes EIA quotquot []	
Dicentee EIA quotquot nascuntur ab Eua	

On the recto of the final flyleaf, the same hand that wrote the English poem has added a Latin-English word list:

Hac in-dentura testatur			
hac vulua	Anglice	cunte	
hic fons	Anglice	funte	
hic inanitus [<i>< inanio</i>	Anglice	muke	[= muck]
= to evacuate]			
hie oculus	Anglice	nee	[prosthetic n]
hae musca	Anglice	flee	
hic apes	Anglice	bee	
hic domiducus	Anglice	bryde	[= bridegroom]
Equit-o -as	ys	to ryde	
Man-eo -es	ys	to byde	
hic lapis	Anglice	stane	
hic os, ossis	Anglice	bane	
Null-us -a -um	Anglice	Nawne	
hic peries	Anglice	A wall	
hec pila	Anglice	A bawll	
Voc-o -as	Anglice	to call	
Port-o -as		to beyre	
Aud-io -is		to herre	
Iurg-o -as		to sqweyre	
Dum sumus in mundo Viuamus / Omnibus est notum			

^a Since this text is Northern, the contraction for the plural of nouns is rendered is, on the analogy of *annys*. The conventional er, however, has been used to expand the contraction in, e. g. *euer*.

Other indications (as well as some of the foregoing) point more specifically to a dialect of Middle Scots;⁴ but inasmuch as the poem is written before 1500, it serves little to stress these usages: (1) y added to long vowels (*thoyth* 1, *say* 20, *bayth* 24); (2) d lost after n (*gron* 34) and retained (if the spelling reflects pronunciation accurately) for t before er (*nowder* 10); (3) metathesis of r (*brest* 40); (4) correlated as appears *als . . . as* 29-30; (5) adjectives follow the noun (*sleyng sle* 19, *caryng gren* 21, *lears luyd* 45).

There are a number of spellings not recorded in the *Oxford English Dictionary*: *annys* 27, *gron* 34 (ground), *kays* 42 (? causes), *lears* 41, *luyd* 41, *nay* 25, *ponde* 26, *sethe* 42 (sigh), *thoth* 5, *thoyth* 1. Two words provide earlier examples of definition than those given in the dictionary: *can* 5 = skill (first use, 1768), and *ruff* = elation (first use, 1548). The translation poses some difficulties, and may add a few new words to the English vocabulary.⁵

The text follows as it is written in the MS. Slashes indicate the ends of lines, and the punctuation is editorial.

Thoythis fre þat lykis me, qwar I go stylly as any ston, I / may thynk qwat euer I well, and as leff as nay leffand mane. /	verso
	4
thoth ys my can, thoth ys my play; thoth ys my ruff, and all my / red; Allas, I luff and der not say — war not gud thoth, I war bot dede. /	8

4 MS. as leff at 8 war above line

1 *OED* thought 3b: "Thought is free: one is at liberty to think as one will (1580)."

5 *can*: *OED* can sb 2 gives "skill, knowledge," Wright, *English Dialect Dictionary*, all Scottish examples; Craigie, *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*, "ability," first use 1609.

* See, e. g., Gregory Smith, *Specimens of Middle Scots*, Edinburgh, 1902, pp. xviii-xliv; and James A. H. Murray, "The Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland," *Philol. Soc. Transactions* 1870-72, Pt. II, London, 1873, esp. pp. 121, 125, 127, etc.

* For example, *be-schylde* 19 (accused), *caryng gren* 21 (? green meadow), and *gest* 33 (? throw).

- Allas, I luf *and* der not say,
nowder be luyd nor *ȝt* be stylle.
last tyme I / part my lade fra,
I tuk my leff agans her wyll. 12
- In yon wendow, / qwar we ij stud,
furst tym qwen owr ij luffis be-gan—
yt stekis full sar / at my hart-ruttis,
þe wordis þat sche sad to me þan. 16
- þou ys say blend þou may n[ott] / se
qwa ys þi frend, qwa ys þi fa;
þou ys be-schylde throth sieyng sle,
vn- / happy hart, qwy dos þou say? 20
- fer furth in yon caryng gren,
me thoth / at ȝe and I was met;
qwen I wacang, ȝe war away,
and for yow / bayth my chekis I wett. 24
- I luff yow gudle for nay syn
nor for / nay ponde in private;

13 two letters (? ij) blotted before ij 17 nott last two letters in binding

10 *be luyd nor ȝt be stylle*: neither be noisy not yet be silent. Or a parallel to adv. phr. "loud and still" = under all circumstances.

15 *stekes*: pierces.

17 *blend*: pp blinded (in judgment).

19 *be-schylde*: tr. Trou art accused (OE *be-scyldigian*) through *sle* (sly, deceitful) *sleyng* (slaughter). Wright gives *slee* for nth. counties. *Sleyng* probably represents the verbal noun rather than the present participle, on account of its form in -yng.

21 *caryng gren*: Meaning obscure. "Caryng" is an old name for Palm Sunday, but the word is quite inappropriate in this context. It may be a derivative of *carr* (*OED* 2, *EDD* 1), meadow, low-lying land. *Gren* then would be a modifying adjective.

22 *at* (conj.) the reduced form for *þat* (contrast *þat* 35); so also *at* (rel. pro.) 41, 44 (but again contrast *þat* 45). Smith, *Specimens*, p. xxxiv, notes that "at" as a conj. dies out in MSc by 1500.

23 The meaning is clear, if the syntax halts: When I awoke [from my fancy—*me thoth* 22], you were away. *Wacang* may be simply a mis-writing for "wake and;" or perhaps a present participle by confusion between the -ing form and the Northern form in -and. *OED* partly supports the suggestion of confusion of forms: -ing 2: "At the present day . . . the general muteness of final *d*, and the change of -*in* to -*in*, make the difference only a vowel one: e.g. 'a singan' burd."

25 *syn*: sign or token (of true love).

26 *ponde*: a pawn or pledge, security (*OED* pawn sb 2, 1 b; *EDD* pawnd, Sc. & nth. counties only).

bot annys to se yow on a day, to luk a- / pon [yow] . . . e.	28
Wald god gyf þat ȝe war als trew as euer was / turtyll dowff on tre;	recto
ȝe changgis me neuer for nay now; for qwen god wyll, better may be.	32
gest y my/n anggre in þe se, and yt fell euen dune to þe gron.	
þe man / þat luffis and der not say, þat ys apan to vnderstand.	36
þe man / þat luffis and der not say, ȝt may be sped wyll ay þe last; /	
be yowr awn flesse, der at I say, war nott gud thoyth, yowr hart wald brest.	40
þer lears luyd, at not can / lane, kays me to sethe qwen I suld syng;	
I der / not speke a word with þam, at I luff best of . . . / thyng.	44
þe man þat . . . me of heyr, and be . . . / . . . ys dwellyng,	
	48

domine.

27 blot before on 28 The seventh stanza is repeated, but the page is
 badly torn I luf yow gudle fo . . . syn / nor for na pond in / . . . nys / to
 luk apon yow . . . 35 blot before me 37 MS. gesty; blot after my
 43 MS. der? 46 blot before kays.

27 *annys*: once.31 *nay now*: no new (lover).33 *gest*: ? throw (L. *gestus*, movement).33 *my nanggre*: my affliction.36 *apan*: apaine, with difficulty.39 *your awn flesse*: (fig) your own kindred.41 Tr. These artless (*luyd*) cheeks that can not feign (*lane*—conceal my feedings).42 *kays*: ? causes.42 *sethe*: sithe, sigh.

It is a coincidence that another *Pricke of Conscience* MS., also in Trinity College, Dublin (MS. 158), has a love poem scribbled on its flyleaf.⁶ Poems more suited to adding to the main contents,

⁶ Index, No. 2245; printed Robbins, *Secular Lyrics of the XIV and XV Centuries*, Oxford, 1952, p. 151.

such as prayers or instructions, are found in four MSS. of the *Pricke of Conscience*,⁷ and there is only one other MS. which has a love lyric appended.⁸ Yet flyleaf inscription was a common fashion in which so much of the secular poetry of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was preserved.⁹

This lyric is written in cross-rhymed quatrains. It is noteworthy that by the end of the fifteenth century, those writing in the courtly style were turning to forms which had hitherto been typical of popular origin (that is, not primarily for upper-class interest), the tail-rhyme stanza and the quatrain. The vogue of the Lydgatian rhyme royal and the ballade stanza continued, along with the various forms of the lyrics intended for music,¹⁰ but was not all-dominant. The typical late fifteenth-century collections, such as Rawlinson MS. C. 813,¹¹ and some of the early Tudor song books,¹² document this trend.

Many single lines or phrases in the text may be paralleled with those in other love poems, indicating that the conventions were established and widely known. As well as single poems, items from the three major groups of secular lyrics illustrate the pattern of the later courtly writing, the Rawlinson C. 813, the Capesthorne,¹³

⁷ Bodleian MS. 6936 has *Index*, No. 3196, fragment (vv. 4) of a Father's Instructions to his Son; Bodleian MS 21731 has 4 lines of Advice to the Reader, *Index*, No. 1160; St. John's Coll. Camb., MS. 137 adds a grace for the scribe, *Index*, No. 812; and Sloane MS. 2275 adds two stanzas of a Prayer by the Wounds, *Index*, No. 4200.

⁸ Bodleian MS. 3509, *Index*, No. 2015, printed previously by Flügel with some inaccuracies:

Love wylle I and leve so may be-falle
Hold ȝe not wysdome in the gouernaunce
ffor hit is a peyne vsitte who-so-euer shalle
Euer-more for to a-bide in lovys daunce.

⁹ See Robbins, *Secular Lyrics*, pp. xxx-xxxii.

¹⁰ Best seen, e.g., in Sir John Stainer, *Early Bodleian Music*, London, 1901.

¹¹ Ed. Frederick Morgan Padelford [and Allan R. Benham], *Anglia*, xxxi (1908), 309-397.

¹² Such as BM Addit 319-22, ed. Flügel, *Anglia*, xii (1890), 226-256, with 17 poems in popular stanzas out of 63 texts; Royal Appendix 58, ed. Flügel, *Anglia*, xii (1890), 256-272, has 4 quatrains.

¹³ Ed. Robbins, "The Poems of Humfrey Newton, Esquire, 1466-1536," *PMLA*, lxv (1950), 249-281.

and the Bannatyne series.¹⁴ Here are some examples of stock poetic diction (Trinity Dublin phrases appear first):

war not gud thoth I war bot dede 8

war nocth gud hoip my Haire wald birst in two (*Index*, No. 2517,
Bannatyne)

Allas I luf and der not say 9

I luve and I say not (Bannatyne, *STS* n. s. 26. 22)
Ful ofte tymes to speke hym silf he peyned (*Index*, No. 1068)
I dar noȝt speke but forth I go (*Index*, No. 3418)

I tuk my leff agans her wyll 12

I take my leve ageynst my wyll (*Index*, No. 767, Rawlinson)
I tak my leue ageyne my will (*Index*, No. 137, Capesthorne)
I tak my leif aganis my will (Bannatyne, *STS* n. s. 23. 294)
I take my leue oonly at your good grace (*Index*, No. 1283)
Aȝeyn mi wille I take mi leue (*Index*, No. 2303)

pou ys say blend pou may nott se 17

qua ys bi frend qua ys bi fa 18
when þou thow thynges þe most sure þen art þou most blynde
many on ys false whom þou thynges just (Rawlinson, Item 49)

quen I wacang ȝe war away 23

but when I wakyde ye were awey (*Index*, No. 366, Rawlinson)
but when I waked ther was I alone (Rawlinson, Item 28)
But when I waked she was awey (Rawlinson, Item 29)
Bot quhen I walknyt scho wes away (Bannatyne, *STS*, n. s. 23. 308)
And quhen I walkyn ȝe ar so far me fro (*Index*, No. 2517)

Wald god gyf þat ȝe war als trew 29

as euer was turtyll dooff on tre 30

ȝe changgis me neuer for nay now 31

as true as turtyll þat syttes on a tree . . .
and neuer to change hur for no newe (*Index*, No. 1678, Rawlinson)
trew as turtyll on a tree (*Index*, No. 2421, Rawlinson)
I wyll neuer change yow for any oþer newe (Rawlinson, Item 1)
I wyll neuer change yow for non other new (Rawlinson, Item 13)
be ye stidfast and also true
ffor y wyl not change for old ne newe (*Index* No. 1344, Capesthorne)
þerfore I wil not change you for old ne newe
for ye are as tru as a turtill done in true louyng (*Index*, No. 2597,
Capesthorne)
and y to her to be so trewe
And neuer to chaung for no newe (*Index*, No. 2381)
Say it is hire olde louer þat loueth hire so fre trewe
hir louyng alone not schanginge for no newe (*Index*, No. 3291)

¹⁴ Ed. Hunterian Club; and W. Tod Ritchie, *Scottish Text Society*, new series 22, 23, 26, third series 5 (1928-1934).

alway withowte chaunge of ony newe (*Index*, No. 1086)
 and change me for non oþur newe (*Index*, No. 1330)
 nor for no new me chaung doth she (BM Addit. 31922, f. 34v; and so
 Royal App. 58, f. 3v)

These features of dialect, preservation, and diction indicate the spread of literary interests in Britain, so that by the late fifteenth century a Northern gentleman composes a love lyric in the accepted fashion of his day. The way leads almost imperceptibly into the world of Elizabeth.

RosSELL HOPP ROBBINS

Saugerties, New York

A MIDDLE-ENGLISH DIATRIBE AGAINST BACKBITING

I

In the Middle-English homilies and moral treatises against the seven deadly sins, the graphic descriptions of backbiting and slander were usually subsumed under the activities of Envy (or Detractio). This material has been studied in detail by Dr. G. L. Owst in his substantial work, *Literature & Pulpit in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1933, esp. pp. 450-58). Owst contributed several lively excerpts from unedited MSS to material already in print; the present paper adds to this general body of material by printing a hitherto unprinted verse attack on backbiters (in eighteen 4-line stanzas). It is preserved uniquely in a fifteenth century anonymous fair copy in British Museum MS Royal 18.a.x, fol. 125^r-126^v (Carleton Brown & Rossell H. Robbins, *The Index of Middle-English Verse*, No. 2864). In the transcription below, I have silently expanded several obvious abbreviations and supplied a modicum of pointing.

II

I

(fol. 125^r)

- 1 Seynt Bernard seiþ and so seye I,
 In her counsell come not my sowle
 þat bakbite men and þis skil why,
 For God hatiþ hem, as seiþ Seynt Powle.

ll. 1-4. The reference is presumably to sermon xxiv of St. Bernard of

II

5 And God hym silf seiþ euyn þe same,
 Whoos worde is most of dignyte,
 Hym þat spekiþ hys broþer blame
 I haue purswed with enmyte.

III

10 And no wondir þouȝ God list be
 An enemy most vnto suche one
 For swch one most sleeþ charite—
 þe which is God, as seiþ Seint John.

IV

15 For whan he spekiþ harm of hys broþer
 Hys sowle he sleepþ and charite
 In hem þat heeryn and in all oþir,
 To whom hys speche by hem may fle.

V

20 For oþer entente þan haþ he noon
 But þat all þoo þat may hym here,
 Be stiryd to hate þat man anoon
 Of whom he spekiþ in such manere.

VI

Pus may men see in how schort whyle
 A fleyng word seyde in malys
 Vnnoumbred sowles may dedly fyle;
 Perfore þis psalme þus writhen is.

VII

25 Whois mouþ is ful of yuel seiying
 To schede oute blood þei haue swifte fete.
 For what is swifter rennyng
 Pan worde abrode whan it dooþ flete?

(fol. 125v)

VIII

30 For one is he þat spekeþ ille
 And but o worde he saiþ & ȝit
 þat onely worde at onys may kille
 As many sowles as heriþ it.

Clairvaux which is directed "contra detestabile vitium detractionis" (see Migne. *Pat. Lat.* CLXXXIII, col. 894), and which cites St. Paul (see l. 4) from *Romans* i; 30: *Detractores Deo odibiles. . . .*

l. 12 *First Epistle of St. John*, iv; 16: *Deus charitas est, et qui manet in charitate, in Deo manet, et Deus in eo.*

IX

- 35 But in þis synne men falle all day,
 On sundry wyse more harm it is
 For sinn mennys tunge go so astray
 þat þei kunne nauȝt but speke amys.

X

- 40 Conscience, kynde and curtesye
 Be fledde awey fro such a man.
 Desclaundre, lesyng, ribaldye—
 þes be þe lessounys þat he kan.

XI

- And summe þer be þat feyne to hyde
 þe malyee þat is in her herte;
 But who so lyst a whyle abyde
 Ful biterly it will oute sterte.

XII

- 45 But or to come he sygheþ sore
 He whettip his tunge or he seye ouȝt
 It semeþ he loueþ þat man þe more
 But all is hate were it well souȝt.

XIII

- 50 And in so mochel he doþe more ylle
 þat it semeþ to hem þat heere
 As all were seyd aȝens hys wille
 With pitee and wiþ moanyng chere.

XIV

(fol. 126r)

- 55 Certys he seyþ, "I am sory,
 For I haue louyd þat man ful wele."
 But loo, he sleeþ so sotelly
 þat vnneþe herers kan it fele.

XV

- 60 And ȝit he lyȝeþ riȝt openly,
 He cowde neuere loue in soopfastness;
 For who so kan speke so prively
 His speche is all but hatefulnesse.

XVI

- And loue þer is noon is hys mawe
 But þer it is he sleep a sone
 þat is in hem þat heres hys sawe.
 What in hym is, þus haþ he done.

XVII

65 Man, þenk þi speche makeþ þe cowþe—
 Þi tung declareþ what man þou art!
 And þerfore Cryst seiþ þat þe mowþe
 Spekeþ of þe habundaunce of þe hert.

XVIII

70 A gode man ay he spekeþ well,
 A bad man ay he bereþ forþ ylle.
 And þus seiþ Cryst in hys godspell
 þat worde schal sauue euryche man or spille.

I. 70 *St. Luke*, vi; 45: Ex abundantia enim cordis os loquitur.

University of Florida

R. H. BOWERS

A LOST JACOBEAN *PHOENISSAE*?

In one of his conversations recorded by Bishop Plume, Ben Jonson, seeking a parallel to certain anachronisms in Shakespeare's histories, remarks, "So Tom Goff brings in Etiocles & Polynices disc^{ng} of K. Ric. 2^d."¹ Now no known play by Thomas Goffe (1591?-1629), the Oxford dramatist to whom Jonson refers, treats the story of the sons of Oedipus; but all available evidence suggests that such a work existed and may still exist.

There is specific evidence that Goffe knew and responded to Seneca's *Phoenissae*. His *Tragedy of Orestes* (1633) and *Courageous Turk* (1632) both contain speeches translated from Seneca's play.² More impressive, in *The Courageous Turk*, the speeches of a Turkish princess intervening in a quarrel between her sultan-father and her husband are liberally adapted throughout an entire scene (sig. G3^r) from Jocasta's outcries as she comes between her warring sons (446-77).

Furthermore, the circumstances of the publication of Goffe's work suggest that his published plays are quite possibly not the only ones he wrote. Three of the four plays usually ascribed to him

¹ *Ben Jonson*, eds. C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson (Oxford, 1941), I, 185.

² *Orestes*, sig. H3^r, *Courageous Turk*, sigs. G2^r, L^r, L2^r. Cf. "Phoenissae," *Seneca's Tragedies*, tr. Frank J. Miller, Loeb Classical Library (New York, 1927), lines 151-7, 8-11, 664-9.

were written and produced as Christ Church, Oxford, while he was a student there (1609-1623); and all were published posthumously.³ In a dedicatory epistle to *The Raging Turk* (1631), Richard Meighen, the publisher, says (sig. A2^r) that he has acquired two of Goffe's manuscripts and is publishing them "by the consent of his especiall friend," presumably the author of an unsigned set of verses before *The Courageous Turk*, "To the Author, In that, Transcribing his Book, without his knowledge, I was bound by promise to stand to his pleasure to keep it or burne it" (sig. B^r). Probably the manuscript of *Orestes*, which Meighen also published, reached him through this same friend of Goffe's. There is, of course, no reason to suppose that this anonymous person transcribed all of the dramatist's work.

Finally, Ben Jonson, who was well acquainted and much admired at Christ Church, was entertained there repeatedly by his friend Richard Corbet, dean of the college from 1620 to 1628.⁴ On one of these occasions he might quite naturally have been invited to read a manuscript play by Goffe on the theme of the *Phoenissae*.

NORBERT F. O'DONNELL

Bowling Green State University

THE EAVESDROPPERS IN JONSON'S *SEJANUS*

According to Ben Jonson's *Sejanus*, Latiaris, Rufus, and Opsius—supporters of Tiberias and Sejanus—make a conspiracy against Sabinus. Rufus and Opsius are to conceal themselves while Latiaris as agent provocateur leads Sabinus on to treasonable words. Latiaris instructs his companions:

Here place yourselves, betweene the roofe, and seeling,
And when I bring him to his wordes of danger,
Reveale yourselves, and take him (4.95 ff.)

He then goes for Sabinus, and when the two are heard coming, Opsius says: "Shift to our holes, with silence" (4.114).

³ In addition to the plays mentioned here, *The Careless Shepherdess* (1656) is also, perhaps mistakenly, ascribed to Goffe.

⁴ *DNB* s. v. "Corbet, Richard." A number of Christ Church men contributed to *Jonsonus Virbius* (1637-8), the collection of elegies published upon Jonson's death.

When Sabinus has said enough, Opsius rushes in shouting:
"Treason to Caesar."

And Rufus:

Lay hands upon the traitor, Latiaris,
Or take the name thy selfe (4.218 ff.)

Soon the Senators drag Sabinus away. Jonson gives no stage directions.

The note in Herford and Simpson's *Ben Jonson* is as follows:

How was this scene staged? Probably the whole was played on the upper stage. The 'holes' of line 114—Sir E. K. Chambers queries if this was a misprint for 'hole'—must be 'betweene the roofe, and seeling' (95). At line 114 the spies mount a rope ladder into the 'hut' above and draw it up after them; they drop it again at line 217 and descend.

There are difficulties about this explanation. First, was there a trap door in the floor of the hut vertically above the tarras, or was the opening farther forward, over the lower stage?¹ If the latter, a rope ladder, unless fastened below like the shrowds of a sailing-ship, could hardly be used. Second, such a ladder would not be managed entirely from below. Juliet lets down from her window the one provided by Romeo that the nurse smuggles in. In Chapman's *May Day*, the ladder is in the hands of the men below, but more than thirty lines of comedy are given to its fastening by Aemilia on the terrace above (3.3.30-62). In *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, the ladder is provided with "anchoring hooks" and is to be "cast up," yet Silvia will be there ready to fasten it, having agreed to flee with her lover (2.4.182; 3.1.118). Who would accommodate the two Senators with a fastening above? Third, is there any other instance of the use of the hut by normal human actors? Fourth, characters in the hut would not be visible to the audience. Yet during the dialogue of about a hundred lines between Latiaris and Sabinus, the spectators must be conscious that Rufus and Opsius are listening.

There is no indication that Rufus and Opsius, after Latiaris departs, make any considerable movement, though comment on using a rope ladder would be probable. The exhortation to "shift"

¹ John Cranford Adams, *The Globe Playhouse*, Cambridge, 1942, p. 350. But compare a hint of an opening in the ceiling of "chamber" and musician's gallery (p. 227).

comes too late for so difficult a transfer as to the hut. Latiaris has instructed them to place themselves "here," that is in the attic where they are standing. While he is gone to fetch the victim, the two converse on their hopes of advancement from this plot; their dialogue allows Latiaris time to bring Sabinus within earshot. When the two are heard coming, Rufus interrupts Opsius with the words: "List, I heare them come." And Opsius says: "Shift to our holes, with silence." What do the two Senators then do? The answer is supplied by Tacitus, Jonson's source for the passage, quoted in the margin of the quarto, who says that to hear Sabinus' subversive words they applied their ears to holes and cracks ("foraminibus et rimis aurem admovent"). It appears, then, that the eavesdroppers, already in their hiding-place, need only to make a slight movement toward cracks in the floor. They converse and then listen in view of the audience.

Sabinus and Latiaris are said by Tacitus to have talked in a bedroom. Though Jonson does not place their dialogue, it might have been acted in the "study" behind the platform stage, or on the floor above, in the "chamber." If in the first place, the spies would have talked and then listened in the "chamber."² If victim and agent provocateur are in the "chamber," the eavesdroppers would have been still higher up in the music gallery. In the Globe, where *Sejanus* was played, and in other theatres, this part of the theatre was perhaps used by actors.³ At the front of that gallery the spies would be visible even to the groundlings near the stage.⁴

The white-haired Senators do not need to make an unprecedented ascent to the hut on a rope ladder, and the reading "holes," confirmed by Tacitus, fits the possibilities of the Globe Theatre.

Duke University

ALLAN GILBERT

² In the floor of the chamber (the ceiling of the study) there may have been a trap door suitable for eavesdroppers (Adams, p. 297). So evident an opening hardly need be assumed here.

Since this note was written there have appeared Leslie Hotson's "Shakespeare's Arena," *Sewanee Review*, LXI, 347-61, and C. Walter Hodges, *The Globe Restored*, London 1953. In deference to them, the platform stage is to be considered for Latiaris and Sabinus. The eavesdroppers can hardly be elsewhere than above.

³ Chambers, *Eliz. Stage* 2.543; Adams, pp. 298 ff.

⁴ This follows from Mr. Adams' analysis of the visibility of the "chamber" (pp. 296-7).

NATHANIEL LEE'S BIRTH DATE

The prologue to *Constantine the Great*, Lee's last play, contains a quatrain which seems, without unduly straining its meaning, to be the bitter reflection of a despondent man who, at the end of his career had not seen come to pass those promises of greatness of which his youth and early manhood had been so exceptionally full. The four lines are these:

Therefore, all you who have male issue born
Under the starving sign of Capricorn,
Prevent the malice of their stars in time,
And warn them early from the sin of rhyme.

And there seems every reason for accepting the implication that the writer himself was born under the fatal sign of Capricorn—in the Zodiac, between December 22nd and January 19th.

Other than this suggestion there is no recorded information on the date of the poet's birth. While the year remains as indefinite as the day, there is a collection of data which would allow us to assign it to 1651 without the likelihood of great error.

Lee's father, the Rev. Dr. Richard Lee, a graduate of Caius and Gonville College, Cambridge, held the incumbency of Bishop's Hatfield from 1660, and the registers of the parish contain entries for the baptisms of most of the Bishop's family, including Daniel (1652), Richard (1655), John, "ye 10th child" (1662), and Emmanuel, "his sixt sonn" (1677). In addition there was another older son called Samuel, besides Nathaniel. Of the eleven children presumably constituting the family, the baptismal records are to be found only for those born after 1652.

The present rector of the Hatfield parish, the Rev. S. E. Woods, advises that the registers contain entries no earlier than 1652, that the earlier ones have been lost or destroyed over the years, and that Richard Lee, although he actually held the Hatfield, Hertfordshire, post from 1647 until his death in 1684, did not become resident pastor until 1660.

It is from the circumstances of his schooling that we can place Nathaniel's birth in 1651. It is in reference to his education that the first authentic document in his biography bears testimony:¹

¹ *Alumni Carthusiani*, ed. Marsh and Crisp. p. 27 (1913 ed.). Compiled from the school registers. R. G. Ham (*Otway and Lee*, 1931), was first to note this.

20 May 1658. Nathaneill (*sic*) Lee. For the Earle of Salisbury. Exhibitioner 22 June 1665 of Trinity college, Cambridge, admitted 7 July 1665, B. A., 1668.

and with this there develop a number of difficulties.

Lee has traditionally been considered an ex-pupil of Westminster School, London, and the official *Record of Old Westminsters* includes an entry under his name. However, while Venn² records: "School, Westminster. (exhibitioner from Charterhouse, 1665)," there is no record in the archives of any pupil Lee at this time. This is of itself insufficient evidence to disprove that he attended Westminster, for the register of admissions was rather arbitrarily attended to and contains no mention of scores of others whose attendance is most reliably and conclusively attested.

Oldys, who obtained information about Lee from the ageing Bowman, pencilled in the margin of his copy of Langbaine's *Account of the English Dramatic Poets*, which is in the British Museum, his reckoning from the actor's statement that Lee was nineteen when *Sophonisba, or Hannibal's Overthrow* was performed, and concluded that he was born in 1657.

This would mean that Nathaniel was just eleven years old when he went up to Trinity College, for the Admissions of that institution record:

LEE, Nathaniel, Pensioner. July 7, 1665. Tutor, Mr. Pulleyne. Matriculated, 1668. Scholar, 1668. B. A., 1668/9.

Although it was not uncommon during the seventeenth century for students to proceed to the universities at fourteen or fifteen (with the average age sixteen), there is no instance of anyone as youthful as eleven having gone up.

It is impossible that Lee could have graduated, acted in London, seen *Nero* and *Sophonisba* published, and joined the company of the wits before he was nineteen. Oldys realised in part, the apparent absurdity of his inaccurate calculation, and reworked it so that the date of birth of the dramatist was 1654. But Oldys must have been far from certain of the facts and when he wrote that Lee was "about thirty-five years of age" at his death, he was probably again depending wholly on the accuracy of Bowman's imperfect memory. The fact that *Sophonisba* was first

² *Alumni Cantabrigiensae*, Part 1, Vol. 3.

produced at Drury Lane in April of 1675 and the custom of writing this date as 1675/76 could explain an error in calculations of one year.

Sir Sidney Lee in his article on Nathaniel Lee in the *Dictionary of National Biography* to which all Lee scholars are undoubtedly indebted, evidently assumed that Oldys' "1654" meant 1653/54, and so recorded this amended date as 1653. This date has until recent years been unquestioned. Dr. William van Lennep of the Harvard University Drama Library has reason to believe that 1648 should be accepted as the correct birth date of our author, but upon investigation this date would appear too early, as may be seen from the following: if he were born in 1648 he was to be found at the university not before he was seventeen, which denies the precocity with which he has been credited and in effect implies that he was less sedulous and ambitious than his fellows. Further, the dates of his leaving Cambridge and of the publication of his first tragedies militate against the acceptance of this explanation. The Oldys dating is less satisfactory still, for if Lee actually started at Charterhouse in 1658 he would have been but four or five. However the rules governing admission to the school at the time are specific in stating that under no circumstances whatsoever is the minimum age to ten years to be varied.

The problem is not enigmatic, however, and can be satisfactorily resolved in accordance with all the known facts of chronology. Having been nominated for Charterhouse in 1658 by the Earl of Salisbury, Nathaniel was sent the same year to Westminster school which had less strict rules governing the minimum age of admission, and remained there until he was ten. He then, having gained a place, transferred to Charterhouse from which school he gained an exhibition on June 22nd, 1665 before going up to Trinity on July 7th of the same year.

Salisbury, who had his seat nearby to Hatfield and who doubtless was a friend of the Rev. Dr. Lee, evidently nominated Nathaniel for the school on May 20th, 1658 in anticipation of a wait before a place would be available. The boy, had he been born in 1651, would then have been about seven, and would have received his elementary education from his father as tutor. Then in the same year he evidently commenced his schooling at Westminster where he stayed until 1661 (aged 10) when he was admitted to Charter-

house. From here he went to Trinity College in 1665 (aged 14) and graduated in 1668 (aged 17).

Thomas Sutton, the founder of Charterhouse, intended the school, as did most of the founders of the English Public Schools, as one for the less fortunate children, and the Rules state, *inter alia*, "No children shall be placed there whose parents have an estate in lands to leave unto them, b t only the children of poor men that want the means to bring them up." Mr. Ham feels that, in applying to the school governors (one of whom was Salisbury) for a place for his son, Dr. Lee would have been obliged to urge the claims of poverty. While he in fact had no "estate in lands to leave," he would not be so obliged, for free places were customarily filled by the children of the clergy—especially when they evidenced some academic talent. In any case Bishop Lee would likely have had no compunction in asking Salisbury to speak on Nathaniel's behalf, for nepotism and favour were not unapproved. But there is no reason to believe that the place was a free one rather than one of the few expensive paid places.

A. L. MCLEOD

Teachers' College, Wagga. N. S. W., Australia.

THE ASSOCIATION OF IDEAS IN SAMUEL JOHNSON'S CRITICISM

Samuel Johnson is not, of course, an associationist like Hartley or Hume, or a member of the psychological school of criticism that drew upon the theories of these two philosophers. But he does reveal in his writings some awareness of associationist thought and method. It is the purpose of this brief note to discuss the extent of the psychology of the association of ideas in Johnson's publications and to elucidate that part of his literary criticism which employs this important eighteenth-century psychology.

Compared with such theoretical critics of his day as Hume, Gerard, and Kames, Johnson is obviously the popular, non-philosophic writer. His is largely a pragmatic criticism that ignores the foundations of esthetics. The critical theory of these members of the "Scottish school" is never discussed by Johnson, although Boswell does once say that Johnson has nothing but praise for

Kames's *Elements of Criticism* (1762), the merit of Kames being, according to Johnson, that "he has told us old things in a new way." Johnson, however, has not attempted a psychological synthesis like that in the *Elements*, and the psychology that underlies his critical assumptions is generally traditional, the commonly accepted psychology explained long before by Locke and adapted by Addison in his *Spectator* series on the imagination. For example, memory, Johnson explains in *Idler* 44 (February 17, 1759), is fundamental to the other faculties of the mind, and imaginative creation is a matter of "compounding" remembered sense impressions into complex ideas: "Judgment and ratiocination suppose something already known, and draw their decisions only from experience. Imagination selects ideas from the treasures of remembrance, and produces novelty only by varied combinations."

True, this psychology of the imagination can be given, as Hartley and Hume have shown, an elaborate associationist interpretation; however, Johnson prefers the popular cliché. But this is not to say that in his writings Johnson does not at all use the psychology of the association of ideas, certainly well known in his day.

To the intelligent lay mind of the mid-eighteenth century, the term "association of ideas" usually meant "connection of ideas." Such a definition, probably acceptable to almost everyone at the time, is found in Johnson's *Dictionary* (1755) together with an illustrative sentence taken from Isaac Watts' *Improvement of the Mind* (1741), a little book that Johnson cherished: "Association of ideas is of great importance, and may be of excellent use."¹ Although this illustration is unhappily chosen, yet indirectly it

¹ Johnson, "Life of Watts," *Works* (London, 1810), xi, 245. Cf. Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1739), I, iv, "Of the Connexion or Association of Ideas."—*An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (1748), Sec. iii, "Of the Connexions of Ideas." In the 1750 edition "connexions" becomes singular; thereafter it becomes "association." The context of the quotation from Watts is as follows [*The Works of Isaac Watts* (London, 1813), VIII, 129-31]: "When you would remember new things or words, endeavour to associate and connect them with some words or things which you have well known before, and which are fixed and established in your memory. This association of ideas is of great importance and force, and may be of excellent use in many instances of human life. One idea which is familiar to the mind, connected with others which are new and strange, will bring those ideas into easy remembrance"

suggests the respectable position of the associationist psychology in Johnson's estimation. The definition, however, does not make clear the nature of a complex behavior of ideas in the mind and suggests nothing about habit formation and the several different ways in which ideas may be connected or associated. For our purpose of explaining Johnson's use of this psychology, a more adequate description and a better working definition is that in Ephraim Chambers' *Cyclopaedia* (1727), since here the nature of the association and the controlling principle are both mentioned: "Association of Ideas, is where two or more ideas, constantly and immediately follow or succeed one another in the mind, so that the one shall almost infallibly produce the other; whether there be any natural relation between them or not."²

It is such a definition of the association of ideas, adapted from Locke's chapter "Of the Association of Ideas" in the fourth edition of his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1700), that best explains Johnson's use of the psychology in *Rambler* 135 (December 24, 1751):

A single injury may be soon dismissed from the memory; but a long succession of ill offices by degrees associates itself with every idea, a long contest involves so many circumstances, that every place and action will recal [sic] it to the mind, and fresh remembrance of vexation must still enkindle rage and irritate revenge.

Here, of course, Johnson does not give the psychology a literary application. Likewise, in a formal letter to Mrs. Thrale (November 13, 1783), he uses it in the usual Lockean sense of a revival of connected ideas and emotions, the result of some stimulus:

A sudden blaze of kindness may by a single blast of coldness be extinguished, but that fondness which length of time has connected with many circumstances and occasions, though it may for a while [be] suppressed by disgust or resentment, with or without cause, is hourly revived by accidental recollection. To those that have lived long together, every thing heard and every thing seen recalls [sic] some pleasure communicated, or some benefit conferred, some petty quarrel or some slight endearment. Esteem of great powers, or amiable qualities newly discovered, may embroider a day or a week, but a friendship of twenty years is interwoven with the texture of life.³

² The source is the fourth edition (London, 1741).

³ *Letters of Samuel Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill (New York: Harper, 1892), II, 350.

That Johnson was familiar with the process of the association of ideas cannot be doubted. It remains for us to determine its significance in his criticism.

Johnson does not often use the associationist psychology to explain the special emotional effects produced by certain literary works. At most, the psychology appears about six or seven times in his criticism, perhaps the most obvious appearance being the analysis in *Rambler* 168 (October 26, 1751) of the propriety of Macbeth's diction. Thus the idea of neo-classic decorum is re-interpreted in the light of Locke's version of the associationist psychology, "an old thing told in a new way." Writing about the sources of the mean connotations of certain words, Johnson refers explicitly to a customary association of words with low objects or with the speaker's low social origin:

No word is naturally or intrinsically meanner than another; our opinion therefore of words, as of other things arbitrarily and capriciously established, depends wholly upon accident and custom. . . . Words become low by the occasions to which they are applied, or the general character of them who use them; and the disgust which they produce arises from the revival of those images with which they are commonly united. Thus, if, in the most solemn discourse, a phrase happens to occur which has been successfully employed in some ludicrous narrative, the gravest auditor finds it difficult to refrain from laughter, when they who are not prepossessed by the same accidental association, are utterly unable to guess the reason of his merriment. Words which convey ideas of dignity in one age, are banished from elegant writing or conversation in another, because they are in time debased by vulgar mouths, and can be no longer heard without the involuntary recollection of unpleasing images.⁴

This process is illustrated by Johnson with what he believes to be Shakespeare's inappropriate diction in the dagger scene before Macbeth murders Duncan. Such words as "dun," "knife," and "peeping through a blanket," Johnson believes, stimulate vulgar associations of ideas entirely inconsistent with the sublime emotion of terror that the dramatist wishes to evoke.⁵

⁴ Something like this associationist criticism appears briefly in *Rambler* 140 (July 20, 1751), where Johnson comments on the indecorum in Milton's *Samson Agonistes*: "All allusions to low and trivial objects, with which contempt is usually associated, are doubtless unsuitable to a species of composition which ought to be always awful, though not always magnificent."

⁵ Associationist theories of language and diction are by no means un-

Similarly applying his critical instrument, associationist decorum, Johnson censures Cowley for failing to adapt his language to his thought. According to the ideal, splendid and heroic sentiments require elevated diction; but Cowley neglects to use elegant diction in his odes: "He seems not to have known, or not to have considered, that words being arbitrary must owe their power to association, and have the influence, and that only, which custom has given them."⁶ Not much unlike this criticism of Cowley is that of Dyer. Johnson notes the difficulty of writing poetry about trade, Dyer's concern in *The Fleece*, because it is "an unpleasing subject." Hence, because of a habitual association of undignified ideas with this content, such poetry cannot give esthetic pleasure:

When Dyer, whose mind was not unpoetical, has done his utmost, by interesting his reader in our native commodity, . . . the meanness naturally adhering, and the irreverence habitually annexed to trade and manufacture, sink him under insuperable oppression.⁷

But, on the other hand, the opposite is true of Milton's *Paradise Lost*; the subject here is too lofty for poetry because of its association with religion. The end of poetry, the pleasure of the imagination, is unattained because, in this instance, the association of ideas

common from the beginning to the end of the eighteenth century. Wordsworth, as is well known, has used this psychology to explain his difficulties with diction (the word "idiot," for example) in the "Preface" to the *Lyrical Ballads* (1800). The following philosophers who have speculated on the relationship between ideas and words furnish in part the background for Johnson's associationist theory of decorum: George Berkeley [Complete Works, ed. A. C. Fraser (Oxford, 1901), I, 132, 151, 199-200; II, 165, 169, 324-9, 344, 397-8]; Francis Hutcheson [*An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions* (London, 1728), pp. 10-11; *A System of Moral Philosophy* (London, 1755), I, 29-31]; Isaac Watts [*Logick* (London, 1725), pp. 30, 81]; David Hume [Works, ed. T. H. Green and T. H. Grose (London, 1875), I, 325, 328-31, 393-4, 510]; Anonymous [*An Enquiry into the Origin of the Human Appetites and Affections, shewing how each arises from Association* (1747), Sec. VI, Arts. 6-8, in Samuel Parr's *Metaphysical Tracts by English Philosophers of the 18th Century* (London, 1837)]; Edmund Burke [*Philosophical Enquiry into the Sublime and Beautiful* (1757), Part V, *passim*]; Alexander Gerard [*An Essay on Taste* (1759), Pt. I, Sec. iii].

⁶ "Life of Cowley," *Works* (London, 1792), IX, 64.

⁷ "Life of Dyer," *Works* (London, 1810), XI, 274-5.

is far too serious, "too ponderous for the wings of wit." Hence the poem may be admired, but it can give no esthetic pleasure. The associated religious ideas suggested by the scenes in the epic, Johnson declares, inspire awe, belief, or adoration, and, therefore, they are properly effective only in a real religious situation:

Of the ideas suggested by these awful scenes, from some we recede with reverence, except when stated hours require their association [prayer, devotion, church attendance]; and from others we shrink with horrour, or admit them only as salutary inflictions, as counterpoises to our interests and passions. Such images rather obstruct the career of fancy than incite it.⁸

In all these discussions of poetical indecorum, Johnson's reliance on the associationist psychology is only casual, as the psychology appears but briefly, never ordering the criticism, never exploited either intensively or extensively in the manner of Gerard in the *Essay on Genius* or Alison in the *Essays on Taste*. One additional illustration will suffice to make this point conclusive. In *Rambler* 143 (July 30, 1751), Johnson discusses imitation and the causes of plagiarism in accordance with Locke's analysis of habit formation: "There is likewise a common stock of images, a settled mode of arrangement, and a beaten track of transition, which all authors suppose themselves at liberty to use, and which produce the resemblances generally observable among contemporaries." But, unfortunately, other than offering this suggestive remark, Johnson ventures no deeper into the psychology of the problem.⁹

Other than the instances noted herein, Johnson does not employ the association of ideas in his criticism. Two possible exceptions to this statement are in *Rambler* 169 and in the tenth chapter of *Rasselas* where Imlac echoes the terminology of associationism in his advice to the poet: "he is to exhibit in his portraits of nature

⁸ "Life of Milton," *Works* (London, 1792), ix, 172-3. Further objections to religious subjects in poetry may be found in the "Life of Waller," *ibid.*, ix, 274-6.

⁹ Coincidentally, Bishop Hurd has dealt with the very same literary problem, but he gives a more analytical associationist explanation of "imitation." Hurd's essay "On Poetical Imitation" appears in his edition of Horace, *Q. Horatii Flacci Epistolae ad Pisones, et Augustum: with an English Commentary and Notes: To which are added Critical Dissertations* (London, 1766), III, 1-146. The essay first appeared in 1751. For the associationist explanation of imitation and plagiarism, see pages 93-100.

such prominent and striking features, as recall the original to every mind." But because Imlac does not further elaborate on the psychology of poetical imitation, we can only guess at the precise meaning of the word "recall."¹⁰

That Johnson understood the psychology of the association of ideas and employed it in his writings cannot be disputed. Johnson adopts Locke's interpretation of this psychology, and in his literary criticism he applies it best, we may conclude, to the neoclassical concept of decorum, especially the propriety of diction and subject matter.

MARTIN KALLICH

South Dakota State College

THE CANON AND CHRONOLOGY OF WILLIAM GODWIN'S EARLY WORKS

Because none of Godwin's biographers have included a complete list of the early works which Godwin wrote in the period from 1782 to 1784, it is not generally known that he published many writings of a varied nature before he began writing *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice*. Even Charles Kegan Paul, who wrote the first and still the best biography and had access to Godwin's

¹⁰ *Rambler* 169: "One of the most pernicious effects of haste, is obscurity. He that teems with a quick succession of ideas, and perceives how one sentiment produces another, easily believes that he can clearly express what he so strongly comprehends; he seldom suspects his thoughts of embarrassment, while he preserves in his own memory the series of connection, or his diction of ambiguity, while one sense is present to the mind." For the meaning of the word "recall," see Scott Elledge, "The Background and Development in English Criticism of the Theories of Generality and Particularity," *PMLA*, LXII (March, 1947), 173. In *Rambler* 185, quoted above, and in *Rambler* 36 (July 21, 1750), this word appears in a similar context: "Poetry cannot dwell upon the minuter distinctions, by which one species differs from another, without departing from that simplicity of grandeur which fills the imagination; or dissect the latent qualities of things, without losing its general power of gratifying every mind by recalling its conceptions." In his *Dictionary*, however, Johnson does not at all define the words "recall," "recollect," "recollection," in accordance with the associationist psychology.

manuscripts, failed to list all of them and gave only a sketchy description of the nature of those he did list.¹ Since all later biographers follow Paul, they have unavoidably perpetuated his omissions. My chief intention here is to give the complete list of these early works, exclusive of Godwin's writings for such periodicals as the *English Review*, the *New Annual Register*,² and the *Political Herald and Review*, and to show their chronology.

In one of the notes for his autobiography Godwin lists these early publications methodically and indicates their chronology, usually referring to the date on which he finished the work. Here is his complete note:

Chatham begun	July 1782
finished	Nov ^e 30
published	Jan. 20, 1783
Lecture I delivered	Apr. 16 —
Rockingham Party	May —
Account of a Seminary	June —
Herald of Literature begun	July —
Sermons revised	Aug. —
Herald of Literature find ^d	Oct. —
Damon and Delia	Nov. —
Italian Letters	Dec. —
Instructions to a Statesman	———
Imogen begun	Jan. 1784
English Review	Feb. —
Annual Register	July —
Engagement with Webb [Godwin's private pupil]	Mar. —
Political Herald	July —

With the aid of the Burney collection of newspapers, I have been able to find the publishing date for all of these except *Damon and Delia*.

Godwin was scrupulously exact about the publishing date of *The History of the Life of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham*. The *Morning Chronicle*, and *London Advertiser* lists it as being published on Monday, January 20, 1783. It was printed "for the author" and

¹ William Godwin: *His Friends and Contemporaries* (Boston and London, 1876); see Vol. I, 19-21 and *passim* for his information about these works.

² See my article, "William Godwin's Writing for the *New Annual Register*," *MLN*, LXVIII (Nov., 1953), 477-479.

sold by G. Kearsley. The second edition was published on Wednesday, April 2.³

Though Paul mentions *A Defence of the Rockingham Party, in Their Late Coalition with the Right Honourable Frederick Lord North* (1, 20), he says nothing about it, and none of the later biographers discuss it. *The Defence* is important because it shows Godwin's active support of the Foxite Whigs. It was printed for J. Stockdale, and the *Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser* shows that it was published on Monday, May 5, 1783.

In August, 1783, Godwin decided to establish a private school and wrote a pamphlet to recommend his plan. *An Account of the Seminary that will be Opened on Monday the Fourth Day of August, at Epsom in Surrey, for the Instruction of Twelve Pupils in the Greek, Latin, French, and English Languages* was printed by T. Cadell and advertised as published on Wednesday, July 2, 1783, in the *Morning Herald, and Daily Advertiser*.

Although Godwin revised his sermons in August, 1783, they were not published until the Christmas holidays; *The Herald of Literature* precedes it. In his fragmentary autobiography, Godwin says, speaking of his activities in the year 1783: "I composed a pamphlet entitled the *Herald of Literature*, which was not published until the following year." And the title-page of the pamphlet itself has the following information about the publication: "London : Printed for J. Murray . . . MDCCCLXXXIV." However, the pamphlet was post-dated; the *Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser* shows it was published on Monday, November 17, 1783. The pamphlet consists of the original writing by Godwin of reviews and "extracts" of works by famous contemporary authors, works which were never actually written. Godwin's remarks on the various writers show him to be generally an acute critic. Misreading of the section on Hayley, in which Godwin is elaborately sarcastic, has led Ford K. Brown to condemn him as a critic.⁴

³ In the *Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser*, for Saturday, January 24, 1784, the advertisement shows that Godwin has changed printers: G. Robinson now prints the book. The biography was also published in Dublin by Potts, Wilson, Walker, and Byrne in 1783.

⁴ *The Life of William Godwin* (London and Toronto, 1926), p. 22, says: ". . . Godwin's poetic and dramatic criticism could only be considered very youthful, if it were not later evident that in such matters he had at all times very little taste, and that little learned almost by rote from his

Godwin's small book of sermons, dedicated to the Bishop of Llandaff, was published on Friday, December 26, 1783, as the *Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser* notes. This is the only one of Godwin's early publications which contains his name on the title-page.

Though I cannot be absolutely certain, I believe that the next published work is Godwin's *Instructions to a Statesman, Humbly Inscribed to the Right Honourable George, Earl Temple*. In Godwin's note he seems to show that *Damon and Delia* and *Italian Letters* were both finished before this political pamphlet, but I cannot find that they were published before it. The pamphlet is extremely rare. There are no copies in the British Museum or the Bodleian. Paul does not mention it in his biography; hence it has never been ascribed to Godwin. However, Godwin wrote it in late December just after the Fox Whig government fell from power, and the *Public Advertiser* indicates it was published on January 5, 1784. The pamphlet shows Godwin in a bitterly sarcastic mood. It is supposedly written by a Machiavellian hermit who tutored Earl Temple in political chicanery. Godwin, of course, fundamentally disliked statescraft and intensely disliked Temple, whose machinations were largely responsible for the defeat of Fox's East India Bill in the House of Lords. The Bill had passed in the House of Commons by a 2-to-1 majority, but Fox's government collapsed when the Lords voted against it.

During late 1783 and early 1784, Godwin wrote three early novels, none of which has ever been known to his biographers. The first of these, *Damon and Delia, A Tale*, is a small book (12mo) and was published by Hookham in 1784. I have been unable to find mention of it in contemporary newspapers, but conjecture that it was published in late January or early February, 1784. It was reviewed in the *English Review* for February, 1784, and since Godwin was writing for this review then, he may have called to the attention of the reviewer the current publication of his novel. Excerpts from it printed in the *English Review*, III (Feb., 1784), 133-135, may indicate the novel has autobiographical material; unfortu-

various friends. He praised most highly Sheridan's improvements on Ben Jonson (in *The Alchymist*), and the latest volumes of Hayley." Professor Brown's bases of judgment here evaporate when one finds that Sheridan never wrote an "Alchymist" and that Hayley's "An Essay on Novel," which Godwin was "reviewing" was also never written.

nately, I have been unable to find a copy of the novel during several years of searching for it. Godwin's second novel, *Italian Letters; or, The History of the Count de St. Julian*—the only one he ever wrote in the epistolary style—was printed in two volumes by G. Robinson and published on Saturday, July 10, 1784, as the *Public Advertiser* indicates. Godwin's final published early work, the novel *Imogen; A Pastoral Romance*, printed in two volumes by William Lane, was published on Sunday, July 11, 1784, as the *Public Advertiser* shows. Until I discovered a copy of this novel in 1950, it had been unknown to researchers.⁵ The plot of the novel is based largely on Milton's *Comus* and tells of Imogen's (the virgin's) abduction by Roderic (the Comus) and her withstandings his assaults on her chastity. Since a discussion of the novel is beyond the scope of this paper, I shall give it fuller treatment elsewhere.

I have given here a full list and chronology of Godwin's early writings, exclusive of the many articles and chapters he contributed to the periodicals of his day. Identification of these remains for the most part a complex problem, and his writing of them occupied much of his time between 1784 and 1791. This accounts for the dearth of published writings by him during these years before he began writing *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice*.

University of Kentucky

JACK W. MARKEN

CONJOINTURE IN EREC, VS. 14.

In a noteworthy article, *SPh*, XLVIII (1951), 669-692, Professor D. W. Robertson seeks to explain Chrétien de Troyes' crucial lines:

Et tret d'un conte d'avanture
Une mout bele conjointure,

by referring us to Alain de Lille's *De planctu naturae*:

Poetae tamen aliquando historiales eventus joculationibus fabulosis quādam eleganti fictura confoederant, ut ex diversorum competenti *conjunctura*, ipsius narrationis elegantior *pictura* resultet.

⁵ Paul says, speaking of all three novels, that they "appear to have vanished into nothingness as well as forgetfulness . . ." I, 100. Later biographers simply copy or re-state Paul's conclusion.

Thus, he thinks, Chrétien implies that out of a more or less authentic account he has drawn (*tret*) a very fine combination of fabulous elements.

In opposing this conclusion, Mario Roques, *Rom. LXXXIII* (1952), 551, observes among other things that "*tret* serait peu exact s'appliquant à un seul des éléments de cette combinaison . . . et la combinaison ne peut-elle pas se comprendre comme l'arrangement d'éléments divers, de scènes décousues et sans lien, telles que les présentent les jongleurs, *qui de conter vivre vuelent et qui depecier et corrompre suelent l'histoire qu'ils content?*"

With this particular statement of Roques I agree. It fits in with the view I expressed in *Rom. XLIV* (1915-17), 14-36, and elsewhere, that Chrétien employed *conjointure* in the sense of Horace's *junctura* as it appears in the *Ars poetica*, vss. 240 ff.:

Ex noto fictum carmen separar (the story of Erec was known). . . .

Ausus idem: tantum series iuncturaque pollet.

Hence I question Robertson's remark (p. 670) that I "did not find any authority for the Latin *conjunctura* upon which the word *conjointure* was based." Certainly Robertson's reference to *conjunctura* in Alain is a valuable link, since it is the ML equivalent of Horace's *junctura* and the use of *pictura* by Alain in the same passage shows that the well-known *ut pictura poesis*¹ (*Ars poetica*, vs. 361) was also familiar to him. If the use of *sens* (Lat. *sensus*) came from the *Liber Sapientiae*, vii, 7 (cf. *Erec*, vs. 5), the source of *conjointure-conjunctura* was, I maintain, Horace's *junctura*.

W. A. NITZE

Los Angeles

¹ The phrase, as William G. Howard, *Laokoon*, p. xxiii, said, "had the cogency of an axiom." As late as 1719, it occurs as a motto on the title-page of du Bos, *Réflexions sur la poésie et sur la peinture*. Why should Moukés' description of Grammar (vss. 9702 ff.) :

Qui nos enseigne en quel maniere
On doit escrire les figures,
Et assembler les congointures;

be "irrelevant (Robertson, p. 670, n. 7)"? Are not Horace and Alain here speaking about "composition"? On Horace as one of the main sources of mediaeval poetic arts see Faral, *Arts poétiques du xii^e et du xiii^e siècle*, p. 99.

THE SOURCE OF A BALZAC WORK

Honoré de Balzac's *Aventures administratives d'une idée heureuse* has recently yielded some rich ore for students of the author's concept of artistic creation. The unfinished work of 1834 consists of only a *Fantasque Avant-propos*, but in this relatively obscure writing Bernard Guyon particularly has pointed out evidence of the novelist's belief in the existence of ideas as actual living beings of a superterrestrial realm.¹ The work has a serious core beneath its "fantasque" exterior. In addition to such evidence, however, the fragment offers an interesting example of Balzac's creative thought process when we are aware of the source of the *Aventures*.

Marcel Bouteron indicates in his notes for the *Aventures* that Balzac selected as his example of an idea of this type the real scheme for an Essone River canal.² This engineering project had come to the minds of various technicians unknown to each other, and Balzac inferred the autonomous existence of the idea over a span of centuries. He personified the idea as "M. Canal, le comte de Lessones," an incredibly aged man. Balzac's projected work apparently called for an account of the misadventures of the idea at the hands of politicians.

So much is clear, but we must add the fact that the novelist's brother-in-law, Survile, was a civil engineer who nursed hopes of building this very canal. Thus the *Aventures* was intended as help for the husband of Balzac's favorite sister, Laure. The writer's letters show this and at the same time, and more importantly, they show the origin of the peculiar form of the work. Through "M. Canal" we can see into some of the creative workings of Balzac's mind.

The *Aventures* takes its shape from nothing other than a family joke started by the novelist. In his letters to his sister Laure he amusingly called his brother-in-law "M. Canal." He used the nickname as early as 1829, for he closed a letter of that date: "Une poignée de main au Canal."³ By 1833 the *Aventures* was under

¹ Bernard Guyon, "Balzac et le mystère de la création littéraire," *RHL*, April-June, 1950, pp. 168-191.

² Balzac, *Oeuvres diverses*, ed. Bouteron and Longnon (Paris, 1938), II, p. 729 (Notes).

³ Balzac, *Correspondance* (Paris, 1876), p. 80.

way, grown in Balzac's mind from the germ of the nickname. "Poignée de main fraternelle à M. Canal; dis-lui que les *Aventures d'une idée* sont sur le chantier et qu'il les lira bientôt."⁴

This information is meaningful not only as a sidelight on the work but also as a demonstration of the profit which Balzac could draw from his deliberate fanciful handling of words and ideas. The work owes its unique form, and indeed its being, to the author's habit of such verbal play. His early letters demonstrate his predilection for it, and one may call to mind the play with the word "panorama" in *Le Père Goriot*.

The *Aventures* is thus of less interest as Balzac's effort to help Surville than as an example of the novelist's method which made from such material a highly personal creation. Out of "M. Canal" came the *Fantastique Avant-propos*, unusual propaganda for the building of a canal, to be sure, for it is a statement of Balzac's serious concept of ideas as autonomous entities.

HALLAM WALKER

Roslyn Heights, N. Y.

ANOUILH'S *MÉDÉE*: A DEBT TO SENECA

Most of Anouilh's plays, whether they be "roses," "brillantes," or "noires," deal in varying degrees of intensity with the incompatibility of purity and integrity on the one hand, and the crass compromise, the petty venality of the everyday world on the other. Perhaps his most frequently recurring word, and the most disputed "value" in his plays, is "happiness"—*bonheur*. In *Eurydice* it may be the comfortable life, with copious meals, fat cigars, and occasional visits to houses of tolerance envisioned by the rhapsodizing father of Orpheus; in the most famous of the *pièces noires* it will be the regular existence, the compromises made for reasons of state and expediency, the realization that life is, as Crémon tells Antigone, "une petite chose dure et simple, qu'on grignote, assis au soleil."

Anouilh's decision to write a *Medea* may be explained by his interest in this theme. *Medea* and Jason, as he recreates the

* *Correspondance*, p. 177.

famous pair, have lived life at fever pitch, in a career of violence closely reminiscent of that of Resistance fighters. As the play begins, Jason has broken with Medea, and the life he shared with her, in favor of the "happiness" of a conformist's life. The struggle, then, is once again between the character (in almost every play the heroine) who refuses to accept less than the absolute, and the compromiser, for whom a doubtful "bonheur" is the only goal, and whose values and those of the world that supports them beat against the wall of his antagonist's resolution.

The French playwright's interest in this opposition, this dialogue between absolutist and compromiser, may also explain why, of the two classical prototypes available to him as source material, he chose Seneca's. In his *Antigone*, he could lean fairly heavily upon Sophocles, because Sophocles provided the fatal interlocking of character he needed; Euripides' *Medea* does not. It portrays, not an interaction, but the effect of Jason's perfidy upon Medea; the pair are wholly estranged by the time the play begins, and their one talk together is a tooth-gritting debate, consisting of claims and counter-claims carefully arranged in chronological order. The central figure who dominates the Greek play is neither unbending nor pliable; she is an immutable force.¹ Seneca's version, on the other hand, presents Jason and Medea as a "couple," stressing throughout their equal responsibility for the heroine's crimes, and underlining the opposition between Medea and "the others." If one forgets for a moment the "typically Senecan" violence and magical incantation, the heroine emerges as a human figure, noble and at moments pitiable, yet possessed of freedom and, as such, contrasted with an earthbound Jason.²

¹ See H. D. F. Kitto, *Greek Tragedy*, London, Methuen, 1951, pp. 188-200.

² Seneca's chief changes in the direction of acquiring sympathy for the heroine are: the unfriendly chorus, her failure to threaten her children, the attempt to banish her without them, the constantly reiterated idea that her crimes have been committed for Jason's sake, Creon's cruelty, and her hallucinations at the end of the play, when, before killing the children, she sees the Furies and the ghost of Absyrtus. Seneca also makes clear that Jason is abandoning Medea to save his own skin; he is an exile "crushed and stricken with heavy fear" (ll. 255-256), who even weakens momentarily in the course of his discussion with Medea. Throughout this paper, line references to Seneca's play are given; for Anouilh, page references are to *Nouvelles pièces noires*, Paris, La Table ronde, 1946.

Anouilh's play, aside from the omission of chorus and prologue, and a few scenic innovations, adopts Seneca's organization. He borrows the sharply ironic opening scene in which the heroine must listen as the sounds of revelry and the strains of the epithalamium bring home to her the full extent of Jason's infidelity. Then, in succession, come the order for her banishment, the nurse's attempt to dissuade her from violence, the interview with Jason, the sending of the deadly gifts and the final catastrophe.³ In key scenes Anouilh closely follows the Senecan dialogue, contracting or expanding it occasionally to suit his purposes. When the nurse begs Medea to hide her grief until the time is ripe for vengeance, Anouilh, like his predecessor in imitation, Corneille, preserves the heroine's proud retort "Medea superest!" In the French play this becomes more laconic: "Que reste-t-il donc? — Moi!" (ll. 150-173; pp. 368-370). Anouilh's Creon, like Seneca's, ironically suggests the heroine go to Colchis: "I, querere Colchis" (l. 197)—"Va à Colchos te plaindre" (p. 372), knowing that death awaits her there. The King's decision to rear the children as his own, and the final conflagration are also taken from Seneca.

A glance at four quite literal borrowings, two of them lengthy, helps further to illuminate Anouilh's special emphasis. The Roman version may indeed have suggested the culminating idea of the French play, the realization by the heroine that, when she has been finally and irrevocably abandoned, she becomes free. Just before escaping in the airborne chariot, Medea cries, "Iam iam recepi sceptra germanum patrem,/ spoliumque Colchi pecudis auratae tenent;/ rediere regna, rapta virginitas reddit" (ll. 982-984), which Anouilh translates, "Désormais j'ai recouvré mon sceptre, mon frère, mon père et la toison du bétier d'or est rendue à la Colchide: j'ai retrouvé ma patrie et la virginité que tu m'avais ravies!" (p. 402). It is not surprising that Anouilh should have picked up, in Seneca's lines, the suggestion that a brutal breaking of the marriage bond may restore her identity to one of the partners, for he had already, in *Eurydice*, shown the fusion of the sexes as intensifying the eternal dilemma of human ability to communicate. For his Orpheus, the tragedy of man-woman relationships is that the sexual union is a false and deceptive one; true understanding,

³ Anouilh slightly alters the time scheme; the marriage being set for the following day.

direct communication, are rendered impossible by it, and from this springs tragedy. Throughout the play, amid her bitterness and chagrin, Médée gropes toward this final awareness that in her marriage she has been torn between sexual dependency and the desire to exist as an individual.

Both dramatists lay bare the sadness and bitterness of the woman abandoned by turning her preparations for flight, so often made before, into an ironic symbol of her aloneness. As Seneca's Medea catches sight of Jason, she exclaims angrily, "Fugimus, Iason, fugimus. Hoc non est novum/ mutare sedes; causa fugiendi nova est—/ pro te solebam fugere" (ll. 447-449). Anouilh translates again, with two minor changes. He shifts to the first person, and deepens the irony by making Médée's statement a reply to Jason's casual, "Où vas-tu?":—"Je fuis, Jason! Je fuis. Il n'est pas nouveau pour moi de changer de séjour. C'est la cause de ma fuite qui est nouvelle, car jusqu'ici c'est pour toi que j'ai fui" (p. 379).

Anouilh also retains unaltered Medea's eloquent plea to Creon, in which she declares love to be the motive of her crimes, for which consequently Jason bears an equal responsibility:

... redde fugienti ratem
vel redde comitem. fugere cur solam
iubes?
non sola veni. belli si metuis pati
utrumque regno pelle. cur sontes
duos
distinguis? illi Pélia, non nobis
iacet;
fugam, rapinas adice, desertum pa-
trem
lacerumque fratrem, quidquid etiam
nunc novas
docet maritus coniuges, non est
meum.
totiens nocens sum facta, sed num-
quam mihi.

(272-280)

Ne me laisse pas partir seule. Rends
à l'exilée son navire, rends-lui son
compagnon! Je n'étais pas seule
quand je suis venue. Pourquoi dis-
tinguer maintenant entre nous?
C'est pour Jason que j'ai tué Pélias,
trahi mon père, et massacré mon
frère innocent dans ma fuite. Je
suis sa femme et chacun de mes
crimes est à lui.

(p. 376)

Seneca's Medea, unlike Euripides', has no refuge; as she explains in her passionate speech to Jason, all doors are closed to her. Again, Anouilh follows his model closely, expanding the speech slightly to include the theme continually stressed by Seneca of "often guilty, but never for myself":

at quo remittis? Phasin et Colchas
 petam
 patriumque regnum quaeque fra-
 ternus crux
 perfudit arva? quas peti terras
 iubes?
 Quae maria monstras? Pontici
 fauces freti
 per quas revexi nobilem regum
 manum
 adulterum secuta per Symplegadas?
 parvamne Ioleon, Thessala an Tempe
 petam?
 Quascumque aperui tibi vias, clausi
 mihi.
 Quo me remittis? (ll. 451-459)

Où veux-tu que j'aille? Où me ren-
 voies-tu? Gagnerai-je le Phase, la
 Colchide, le royaume paternel, les
 champs baignés du sang de mon
 frère? Tu me chasses. Quelles terres
 m'ordonnes-tu de gagner sans toi?
 Quelles mers libres? Les détroits du
 Pont où je suis passée derrière toi,
 trichant, mentant, volant pour toi;
 Lemnos où on n'a pas dû m'oublier;
 la Thessalie où ils m'attendent pour
 venger leur père tué pour toi? Tous
 les chemins que je t'ai ouverts, je
 me les suis fermés (p. 382).⁴

Unlike Seneca's Medea, who if she had no earthly refuge, could at least escape to other realms, Anouilh's heroine perishes in the flames of her gypsy caravan. Anouilh concludes, not with Jason's despairing wail that "there are no gods," but with the conviction that when an orderly society casts out its violent and heroic figures, somehow, in the process, it is they who triumph. In noting his debt to Seneca, I do not suggest that Anouilh's play lacks "originality," or that its good qualities are second hand. The playwright's treatment of his heroine's psychological motives, and above all, his stark presentation of the heroic engulfed by the mediocre, make exciting theatre. Anouilh has adapted Seneca to his own purposes. In so doing, however, he further increases the heavy debt of French drama to the Roman poet, a debt seldom acknowledged, but none the less real.

JOHN C. LAPP

Oberlin College

⁴ Seneca adapted this speech from Euripides, but Anouilh follows Seneca. In his description of the death of Creusa and Creon, however, Anouilh borrows briefly from the Greek.

**SIR THOMAS BROWNE, LAMB, AND MACHADO
DE ASSIS**

In Chapter cxxxv, "Oblivion," of his *Memórias Póstumas de Brás Cubas* (1880), Machado de Assis presents Brás as reflecting on his fifty years:

Venham mais dez [anos], e eu entenderie o que um inglês dizia, entenderei que "cousa é não achar já quem se lembre de meus pais, e de que modo me há-de encarar o próprio ESQUECIMENTO."

Vai em versaletes esse nome. OBLIVION! ¹

So far as I am aware, it has not been noted that the Englishman is Sir Thomas Browne; the text, from *Christian Morals*, III, xxii, is the following:

He [a man of seventy or eighty] may have a close apprehension what it is to be forgotten, while he hath lived to find none who could remember his Father, or scarce the friends of his youth, and may sensibly see with what a face in no long time oblivion will look upon himself.²

It seems doubtful that Machado took the text directly from Browne; I think it more likely that he found it in Lamb's essay "My Relations." Reducing Browne's "seventy or eighty years" to "sixty or seventy," Lamb gives a slightly variant text, possibly quoted from memory:

In such a compass of time," he [Browne] says, "a man may have a close apprehension what it is to be forgotten, when he hath lived to find none who could remember his father, or scarcely the friends of his youth, and may sensibly see with what a face in no long time OBLIVION will look upon himself."³

The *Memórias Póstumas* were first published serially in the *Revista Brasileira* in 1880. In the following year they appeared in book form, introduced by a prefatory note in which Machado acknowledged Sterne, Xavier de Maistre, and Lamb as models for

¹ *Memórias Póstumas de Brás Cubas* (Rio de Janeiro: W. M. Jackson, Inc., 1938), p. 358.

² *Works*, ed. Geoffrey Keynes, I (London: Faber and Gwyer Limited, 1928), 149.

³ *The Essays of Elia* (London: Macdonald, [1952]), p. 114.

the "free form" of his novel.⁴ In later editions Machado omitted Lamb's name; but the 1881 testimony suggests that Elia was fresh in his mind at the time he composed his book. Lamb's reduction of Browne's age limit is probably responsible for Machado's choice of sixty as a vantage point. A typographical detail also supports my hypothesis: in none of the editions of the *Christian Morals* that I have been able to consult is the word "oblivion" written in capitals; it is Lamb who transliterated "oblivion" as "OBLIVION," and it is presumably from him that Machado adopted the trick.

If I am right, we have a further piece of evidence of Machado's reading of Lamb to add to the lone instance quoted by Eugénio Gomes:⁵ the story "O Lapso" (from *Histórias sem Data*, 1884), which not only includes a quotation from "The Two Races of Men" but also exemplifies the theme of that essay. Gomes expresses surprise that Machado took so little from an author with whom he had particular spiritual affinities;⁶ close reading of the *Essays of Elia* and of Machado may well turn up more echoes.

BENJAMIN M. WOODBRIDGE, JR.

University of California, Berkeley

ZU LICHTENBERG UND ARCHENHOLTZ

Heinrich Schneiders Diskussion der Aufnahme der zweiten Ausgabe (1787) des Buchs von Archenholtz *England und Italien* durch Wieland, Goethe und Christoph Joseph Jagemann, *MLN.* LXVIII, 311 ff. regt zu folgender Bemerkung an:

Caroline ersuchte am 4. April 1786 Lotte Michaelis, ihr "Archenholz Reisen durch England und Italien, oder Briefe über diese Länder, wies heißen mag" zu senden, "es soll sehr amüsant und wahr seyn, und es ist uns Dahmens viel daran gelegen" (*Caroline*, hg. E. Schmidt, I, 151), und sie wiederholte ihre Bitte am 28.

* Eugénio Gomes, *Espelho contra Espelho: Estudos e Ensaios* (São Paulo: Instituto Progresso Editorial, [1949]), p. 58 ("Machado de Assis: Influências Inglesas. VI—Lamb").

* Gomes, loc. cit.; also his *Influências Inglesas em Machado de Assis* (Bafá: [Imp. Regina], 1939), p. 14.

* *Espelho contra Espelho*, p. 58.

Mai: "schick mir doch ja Archenholz das nächstmal. Ich sterbe, wenn ich ihn nicht kriege . . . Lichtenberg hat ihn rezensiert." Erich Schmidt bemerkt dazu im Anhang: "Leitzmann [der Herausgeber der kritischen Ausgaben Lichtenbergs] schreibt mir, eine Rezension Lichtenbergs sei nicht bekannt."

Sie findet sich in den *Göttingischen Anzeigen von Gelehrten Sachen* vom 20. Mai 1786, ist sehr ausführlich (793-806) und befaßt sich nur mit dem Band über England. Lichtenberg stimmt begeistert dem Entzücken Archenholz' über alles und jedes in England zu (was einen ja bei Lichtenbergs tiefer Liebe für alles Englische nicht wundern kann):

Es würde gewiß sehr viel Mangel an Kenntnis der Welt und der Würde des Menschen überhaupt, sehr viel Neid und eigne moralische, politische und gelehrt Verdorbenheit dazu gehören, ein Jahr in dem Land gelebt zu haben, ohne größtenteils mit dem Verf. zu stimmen und ohne zu bekennen, daß vielleicht bei keinem Volk auf der Erde im allgemeinen je so viel Treuerzigkeit, Edelmut und wahre Würdigung jedes Standes des Menschen anzutreffen gewesen sei als bei dem englischen . . . Sehr richtig wird bemerkt, daß der Engländer der höflichste Mann von der Welt sei, sobald man reellen Dienst und nicht Worte und Grimassen für Höflichkeit nehme.

Im übrigen ist die Rezension hauptsächlich lobende Wiedergabe des Inhalts des Buchs, vielfach in einem so ungeformten Telegrammstil, daß man sich fragt, warum Heyne einen so nachlässig geschrieben Beitrag des glänzenden Stilisten—mehr Rohmaterial für eine Besprechung als eine Besprechung—überhaupt aufnahm. Heyne muß gewußt haben, daß sein Freund und Kollege zur Zeit der Niederschrift dieser Notizen wieder einmal unter schweren Depressionen litt, die ihm Arbeiten fast unmöglich machten. Das Scheitern der Reise nach Italien hatte ihn der Verzweiflung nahe gebracht, England hätte ein Ersatz werden können. Als Professor Girtanner, sein Arzt, im nächsten Jahr nach England geht, flammt Lichtenbergs alte Sehnsucht nach seinem verlorenen Paradies wieder auf, und er macht ihr in Worten Luft, die sich zum Teil mit denen der Rezension decken und an eine Wurzel seiner eigenen Probleme röhren:

Heil Ihnen, daß Sie in England sind!—Wahrhaftig mein Hertz blutet mir, wenn ich bedenke, daß England noch steht und ich nicht darin seyn kan.— Ich habe, Gott verzeyh mir meine schweren Sünden, schon manchmal im Sinne gehabt, aufzupacken und deutscher Sprachmeister zu werden. Wer weiß was noch geschieht, denn Ihnen kan ich es gestehen, meine Entfernung

von England wird mir zuweilen unerträglich. Ich möchte alsdann immer wissen, warum ich kein Geld habe, und thue diese Frage an den Himmel oft so laut, daß es meine Leute in der nächsten Stube hören. Der Mensch wird nirgends so gewürdigt, als in diesem Land, und alles wird da mit Geist und Leib genossen, wovon man unter den Soldaten Regierungen nur träumt. Nun fühle ich mich etwas leichter. (13. April 1786, *Briefe*, hg. Leitzmann, II, 265.)

FRANZ H. MAUTNER

Queens College

REVIEWS

Piers the Plowman. A Critical Edition of the A-Version. Edited by THOMAS A. KNOTT and DAVID C. FOWLER. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1952. Pp. x + 302. \$4.50.

Over forty-five years ago Professor Knott started preparing a text of the A-version of *Piers the Plowman*, but other duties kept him from finishing it. After his death, Dr. Fowler took over Knott's material and completed the job. The result is this present volume, described in the Preface as "a compromise between a critical and a reading edition." It is both a useful textbook for the beginner and a welcome aid to the scholar.

The introduction (pp. 3-66), explanatory notes (pp. 154-70), and glossary (pp. 254-300) are for the beginning student, and should be read accordingly. The glossary, in so far as I have checked it, is accurate and as complete as necessary. The notes are not as plentiful as I think the student will need. In the introduction a number of matters are discussed: the three versions and their dates; the poet's name and the question of single or multiple authorship; meter and alliteration (actually only the latter is treated); dialect (the point made is sound enough, i.e. that rime and alliteration are often helpful in determining the poet's rather than a scribe's usage, but this is not enough); historical background (mainly ecclesiastical, but very helpful toward understanding the poem); bibliography (selective but up-to-date). There is no systematic discussion of the language, but this is perhaps unnecessary. All in all, it is an attractive and carefully prepared book, well designed to help the beginning student read and understand this fascinating poem.

Among scholars, the need for a better text of *PP* has been keenly felt for a long time. The text provided here (pp. 67-153) is a critical text, for which all seventeen of the known MSS of the

A-version have been utilized. MS T (Trinity College, Cambridge) is used as the base, but its reading is often rejected in favor of that of another MS or in favor of one not found in any MS. When the critical reading adopted differs significantly or strikingly from that of other MSS, or differs at all from that of T, the MS variants are noted. What we get in the eighty-two pages of variants is not all the MS variants but only a relatively small selection. In a true critical edition we would expect a more conclusive discussion of the text (i. e. a fuller explanation than is provided in section V of the introduction, and detailed justification of many of the specific readings adopted) and a complete record of all variants. But, as noted above, the intention of the editors was something less than such an edition, and is satisfactorily fulfilled by the text and textual apparatus provided. Until a complete critical edition of the A-version, and of the other two versions also, is feasible, the Knott-Fowler text will be very useful.

NORMAN E. ELIASON

University of North Carolina

The Subtle Knot: Creative Scepticism in Seventeenth Century England. By MARGARET L. WILEY. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1952. Pp. 303. \$5.00.

This book is the first attempt to deal on a comprehensive scale with one of the central problems of intellectual history in the seventeenth century. As an historical study, its ultimate goal is to push behind Basil Willey's description of an era straddling a slowly widening gulf between the worlds of being and becoming, and to discover in scepticism the common anticatalyst which enabled so many minds to avoid commitment to a monistic metaphysics. Miss Wiley feels that Donne's "The Extasie" "can serve as a kind of symbolic presentation of the scepticism of the seventeenth century" (p. 60). Donne's "'subtile knot which makes us man'" represents not only an intellectual awareness of the fundamental dualism of body and spirit but a more than intellectual perception of the fact that the human entity, which is the prototype of all truth, is not simple and direct. . . . Hence simple truths about body or spirit cannot give the sense of the knotted whole, for the knot is something other than the two strands which compose it" (p. 61). The positive result of discovering this "paradoxical quality of truth" is "the experience, rare, but not abnormal, of finding that a complete despair of truth and a moment of thorough non-attachment to dogmatisms may somehow generate new and enlarged insights—this experience may rightly be called sceptical" (p. 37). In the religiously-oriented

seventeenth century this "creative" scepticism manifested itself primarily in the sceptics' capacity for "transforming the philosophic confusion of their age and the upthrusts of pessimism and heresy into the components of the kind of faith which at least enabled them to come to terms with their world and to do their work in it with calmness and dignity" (p. 13). However, Miss Wiley is writing more than a detached account of a moment in intellectual history; her work is a spiritual credo as well. In the seventeenth century, she says, "I had caught sight . . . of a pattern which was gradually forming itself in my own living . . . our experience seemed made of the same stuff, and to expatiate on their meaning was to make the meaning of my own experience clearer and more explicit" (p. 12). The historical work, then, is but the gradual objectification of the credo of a grimly hopeful twentieth-century spirit. The book closes with a soliloquy by a weary God who proposes that if he were to scourge away the churches in this time of fear man might be forced to tie anew the "subtle knot" and merge "whatever truths inhere in both his religion and his secularism" (p. 281). The existence of the knot in the seventeenth century and its reappearance in a contemporary formula for spiritual recovery are carefully linked in a causal chain. Taking issue with Douglas Bush (as representative of the common view concerning the origin of the disintegration of spiritual foundations in western culture), the author succinctly sums up a thesis which stalks through the final third of her book:

When he judges by the history of modern liberal Protestantism that Latitudinarianism was merely the opening wedge in the eventual destruction of religion, he is losing sight of the fact that what really went wrong, somewhere in the eighteenth century, was . . . the untying of 'the subtle knot.' If the lesson of the latitude-men and the Cambridge Platonists had been thoroughly learned, we should today be much farther along on the road toward a religion geared to our human needs, the needs of all sides of our being (p. 100).

It will be obvious from this brief outline of its nerve center that *The Subtle Knot* attempts what few works of scholarship genuinely do: it tries to show the relevance of the past to the present in a clearly prescriptive context. In a time of increasing scholarly consciousness and conscience concerning aims and methods, it may be that an examination of the root causes of failure in a work which deals with such richly-promising materials can be of more than passing value.

The central section of the book groups brief studies of five seventeenth-century Christian sceptics: Donne, Browne, Baxter, Taylor, and Glanvill. These studies were originally published separately in a variety of journals. Miss Wiley finds five central qualities in seventeenth-century scepticism: an awareness of nescience, a sensitivity to dualisms, an attraction to the paradox as the expressive form in which the complexity of truth is most

closely approached, a confidence in the salutary effect of doubt, and an unwillingness to allow Christian enterprise to lose the name of action when knowledge falters. These qualities are tracked out in the writing of each of the five sceptics, the sensitive essay on Browne providing the most distinguished result of the journey. In each case, Miss Wiley attempts to sound beneath the words and catch the echo of a permanent human temperament which is characteristic of the sceptic. She decides that "behind the paradox lies the characteristic response of Browne to the complex and contradictory aspects of his experience" (p. 158); when Baxter writes against too rational a view of religion, the autobiographical parts must not be considered "merely a part of the argument. They have the ring of authenticity, and the reader feels the same tension as in the rising action of a drama" (p. 170); Taylor writes in "simple and beautiful language whose spine is experience" (p. 187); Glanvill's "searching analysis of the psychology underlying dogmatism is somehow related to the temper of the man as contemporaries have left us pictures of it" (p. 199).

Persuasive as she is when writing at her best, the author has involved herself in a methodological fallacy with such an approach. Scepticism has been singled out as the fundamental quality of the author's *Weltanschauung*. But it has been inferred almost wholly from the explicitly expressive level of meaning in their works. Mannheim, Spitzer, and others have reiterantly reminded us that an author's *Weltanschauung* can be gotten at only by an examination of the implications of his areas of interest, his interweaving of ideas into peculiarly personal groupings, his election of expressive form, and similar keys. The basic assumptions and attitudes uncovered by such an analysis will on occasion corroborate the personality expressed through the rôle of author; but to accept explicitly-stated attitudes as expressive of temperament without such corroboration is methodologically unsound. How foreign to what we know of them our contemporaries would appear were one to approach them with such faith in their candidness and self-insight. Miss Wiley takes a casual step toward implicative analysis when she examines Browne's stylistic affinity for paradox in relation to his scepticism (pp. 156-160). And in this case, where she checks her reading against implication, she makes her most satisfying recreation of the sceptical spirit; coincidentally, Browne is the only member of her group who was not professionally obligated to a body of dogmatic theology. The possibilities for distortion which are inherent in the method are illustrated especially well by the chapter on Glanvill. Finding the sceptic mode at the root of his personality, Miss Wiley concludes that his central aim is a Christian irenic (p. 222). But a further examination of his work complicates her reading, and shows that his irenies are circumscribed within a larger perspective of Anglican apologetics. The preface to Glanvill's first book, his sceptical *pièce de résistance*, indicates that

it originated "as a Corrective of Enthusiasm, in a Vindication of the use of Reason in matters of Religion." Throughout his later works he glosses this comment by (1) exalting the interaction of reason and sensation as a dependable means to realization of the divine nature, and (2) affirming repeatedly that the Church of England, in contradistinction to the rival Roman and "Reprobatarian" theologies, provides a faith founded in reason. This grouping of ideas implies that scepticism was for Glanvill a tool with which to aid the re-establishment of his own theology, an implication made explicit enough when he says that if truth might be followed freely to her lair one would find the "False Doctrines and Fanatical Practices of the Times would be detected and sham'd," and the Anglican fundamentals, "those *Old Truths* that were exploded with so much abhorrence," would enthroned themselves in the free minds of men ("Anti-fanatical Religion and Free Philosophy," p. 13 in the 1676 *Essays*). Nor, while wholeheartedly acknowledging the complex agonies of Donne's spiritual progress, can we ultimately judge him realistically without recollecting that the conclusion of Itrat Husain's thorough study was that "Donne was not an original theologian, his aim in his Sermons was the exposition, the elucidation, and the defence of the doctrines, dogmas and ritual of the Anglican Church" (*The Dogmatic and Mystical Theology of John Donne* [London, 1938], p. xv). In the light of these and other such complications with which one might challenge Miss Wiley's essays, one feels less confident than she that scepticism was the intellectual angle of vision most germane to her subjects' temperaments.

Another methodological failure, one not shared by the individual essays, is manifested in the book. The five essays make up the central third of the volume. But the author has added initial chapters defining scepticism inductively and tracing the history of the sceptical mode of thought through the ancient and medieval worlds. In addition, she follows the seventeenth-century studies with a history of modern scepticism which ends with Sartre. Miss Wiley asks that we view this expanded study as an investigation in the history of ideas, invoking the name of Lovejoy, "a great historian of ideas" in whose spirit her book is undertaken (p. 14). However, she is only vaguely aware of Lovejoy's methodology. Her singling out of the major aspects of scepticism is achieved by finding the common aspects in the views of a number of expressions and definitions scattered from Socrates to Santayana. This is antithetical to Lovejoy's method of dealing with an "idea," which is to exhaustively designate the logical possibilities for its manifestation, then to examine as widely as possible to determine the actual appearances of these manifestations in society. While the first stage often involves one in descriptions of types which have never had historical manifestation, it is a necessary preliminary if one is

to eliminate arbitrary anomalies of description at the second stage, which might occur through unwitting omission of large areas which obligatorily group themselves with the investigator's "idea." Might not such an analysis discover that one outgrowth of Cartesianism was a despair of giving metaphysical being to causality—a despair which grew from a chastening suggestion in Glanvill into the basic form of eighteenth-century nescience? And might one not then speculate that it was this eighteenth-century form of scepticism which forced the nineteenth century to apotheosize process to the final destruction of those absolute orders so carefully preserved in every area by the seventeenth century? Being no philosopher, I have the temerity to suggest the question only in protest against Miss Wiley's ill-balanced attack upon a greatly oversimplified eighteenth century.

A historian who can quote Courthope's summary of Addison's thought, and then write: "Most of these sentiments could be matched among our five sceptics, yet the very tone in which they are uttered in the eighteenth century betrays their shallowness" (p. 234), must herself share somewhat in her description of William Law: "This kind of over-simplification, and hence falsification, is indicative of a mind to which every dualism presents a choice rather than a challenge to synthesis" (p. 248). The rationale for the book's almost invective castigation of the eighteenth century has already been pointed out. But when she comes to grapple with the period at close range, Miss Wiley gets into difficulty. Her central trouble is chronological. On page 197 she tells us that "In the writings of Joseph Glanvill [1661-1681 are his publication limits] the strong current of scepticism which had been flowing underground in many seventeenth-century English writers finally came into the open." This gives scepticism a short career, indeed, since "from 1660 on it slowly went underground" (p. 229). The mixup is symptomatic of an incurable disorder: Miss Wiley recognizes the subordinate nature of scepticism in the earlier seventeenth century, and she recognizes the continuity of spirit of the period from 1660 onward. But she fails to draw the obvious conclusion: that if scepticism has ever been a highly significant mode of English thought, its chief manifestation must have appeared somewhere in an epoch which is admittedly the gestation ground for the modern mind, a period which is usually treated as largely homogeneous with the eighteenth century.

In dealing with details of eighteenth-century thought, things move from bad to worse. Dryden is blithely dismissed twice as the devil's disciple of dogmatism and simplicity (pp. 237, 252); Blackmore is scorned for his naïve simplification when he employs the argument from design in a passage which has its ultimate forebearer in Hooker, and which could be matched by half-a-dozen in Glanvill's works (p. 238); Mandeville is utilized on page 244 as the typical eighteenth-century antagonist to the sceptic's sensi-

tivity to dualism, but four pages later it is regretted that the majority of his contemporaries were "not endowed with Mandeville's insight." These are but random samplings of confusions which dot the eighteenth-century chapter too liberally.

The chapter on scepticism prior to the seventeenth century arouses a somewhat different complaint. In a rather uninviting mass of eighty-four quotations, many of them extensive, there are only eighteen references to primary documents, and these involve but seven sources. The vast bulk of the chapter is a gathering of secondary summaries of philosophic ideas in patristic, medieval, and sixteenth century writers. It is scarcely a procedure calculated to inspire one with confidence in the investigator's bases of judgment. Once, at least, such dependence involves her in the strange description of Agrippa's *De Incertitudine Scientiarum* as a book "which asserted the vanity of all learning" (p. 45). This is something of a euphemism for a merry catch-all which includes, *con amore*, chapters on "dancing" and "whoring."

There is thoroughness in the mechanics of documentation, although one wonders at several quotations from a hitherto unrecorded "1703" edition of Glanvill's *Scepsis Scientifica*, and, in the interests of a faded reputation, there rises a charitable inclination to point out that the mysterious "Morell, *op. cit.*" who appears several times is that J. D. Morell whose scholarly conscience toward his contemporaries led him to give a survey of western philosophies the misleading if not modest title of *An Historical and Critical View of the Speculative Philosophy of Europe in the Nineteenth Century*.

JACKSON I. COPE

The Ohio State University

Theories of Pastoral Poetry in England, 1684-1798. By J. E. CONGLETON. Gainsville: University of Florida Press, 1952. Pp. ix + 355. \$6.00 (cloth); \$5.00 (paper).

Criticism of pastoral poetry abounded in the Restoration and eighteenth century, even though the pastoral poetry written in this same period was mediocre. Yet, Congleton suggests, "no genre reflects so accurately as the pastoral the pervasive transition that took place in literary taste and critical theory in England during the eighteenth century." His study amply demonstrates this evolution over more than a century, from neoclassicism and rationalism to romanticism. Justifiably for his thesis he has limited himself to an examination of theory. But in view of the outpouring of pastoral criticism in the years covered, one would like to see evaluative and more specific application even to the inferior poetry which

motivated it. Such treatment would not overlap the work of W. W. Greg (*Pastoral Poetry & Pastoral Drama*) and William Empson (*Some Versions of Pastoral*), for which he expresses regard. The present approach, largely isolating criticism from literature, has too much of the abstract in it. It entails a foreshortened view in which rules and concepts are out of proportion to esthetic context. Congleton has nevertheless put together a useful if frequently awkward book. His method, comprehensive rather than eclectic, creates an undue sense of repetition. The fault is most apparent in the lavish use of closely parallel quotations (frequently in the original French, Italian, or Latin) with disproportionately scant commentaries and recapitulations which impede continuity and obscure conclusions. He has arranged his material according to chronological and thematic principles.

In Parts One and Two, he traces pastoral theories historically and generally, from their origins in Aristotle, Quintilian, and Longinus, and from their exemplification in Theocritus and Virgil. He proceeds through the Renaissance in England and on the Continent to the seventeenth-century culmination in Rapin and Fontenelle. Rapin, he concludes, was the most influential critic because of the large number of English theorists who drew their concepts from him. Rapin's *Dissertatio de Carmine Pastorali*, translated by Creech and published in England in 1684, became the byword of the neoclassical critics, among whom were Temple, Chetwood, Walsh, Gay, and Pope. Pope's *Discourse on Pastoral Poetry* (1717) was the last significant piece of neoclassical criticism on the subject. Following Rapin's lead, the English neoclassicists stressed absolute principles—insistence on rules, the re-evocation of the Golden Age, veneration of the ancients' theories and practice.

Second only to Rapin in influence was Fontenelle, whose *Discours sur la Nature de l'Églogue* was translated by Motteux and published in England in 1695. Fontenelle, a Cartesian and exponent of the moderns against the ancients, took a position directly opposite Rapin's. He proposed rationalistic and psychological assumptions as the basis of pastoral theory, concluding it possible for writers in his age to equal, if not surpass, those of antiquity. Rapin's faith in classical standards Fontenelle countered with reliance on the potentiality of the individual in any period. Among the English disciples of Fontenelle were Addison, Phillips, Tickell, Purney, Johnson. The rationalists, in the ascendant between Addison's *Spectator* (No. 523) and Johnson's *Rambler* (Nos. 36, 37) and *Adventurer* (No. 92), continued the dispute with the neoclassicists that Fontenelle had projected against Rapin.

Then the romanticists advanced rationalistic theories through greater emphasis on empiricism, rejection of traditional standards of form and content, emotional awareness of nature, and exaltation of primitivistic benevolence and dignity. The romantic school of

V. W.
ompson
The
s too
which
ngle-
ward
s an
ish
ench
and
ons.
the-

ally
and
egil.
anti-
te-
use
pts
by
the
sh,
the
ol-
ute
ge,

is-
nd
x-
ly
as-
le
y.
th
g-
l,
n
3,
p-
h
s
f
n
f
V. W. Warton's *Dissertation upon Pastoral Poetry* (1753) and *Essay on Pope* (1756) and Thomas Warton's *De Poesi Bucolica Graecorum Dissertatio* (1770). Romantic theories dwindled after Hugh Blair's *Pastoral Poetry* (1783).

In Part Three Congleton examines the three schools—neoclassical, rational, and romantic or empirical—for changing concepts of specific pastoral elements. The organization is again chronological as he demonstrates critical attitudes toward the following themes: definitions, origins, purpose, scene, characters, matter, fable, form, verse, language, style, peculiar qualities (i. e., Rapin's notions of simplicity, conciseness, "neatness"). The adherents of each school applied their concepts to determine what a pastoral is and how it is constituted. For purposes of analysis and evaluation this portion of the study should be the most significant. But because the premises have already been stated so fully, because of inevitable duplications, and because the critics apparently had less to say about particular techniques than generalized theories, the final section is not so illuminating as one would hope.

Certain additional weaknesses must be noted. The all-inclusive nature of the work sometimes leads Congleton to negative conclusions (e. g., pp. 216, 218, 238, 240) and even to irrelevancies (e. g., he invokes Johnson on generality and biography [pp. 186, 220] without visible pertinence). Through strict chronological presentation in at least one instance he distorts organization (in pp. 108 ff. he reverts to neoclassicism after a full statement of both neoclassicism and rationalism). Fable, which he gives cursory treatment (pp. 241 ff.) without conclusion, he apparently does not distinguish from allegory, already treated as part of "Matter" (pp. 231 ff.). And he does not make sufficiently intense the distinction between "Matter" and "Characters." Typographical slips are minor faults yet troublesome (e. g., p. 261, "Hookum Frere" for John Hookham Frere; the latter spelling appears in the index). Syntax is sometimes unwieldy and confusing. The designation of romanticists as "left-wing critics" is questionable and misleading. Finally, under the very definitions he has compiled Congleton errs in calling "Michael" a pastoral poem (p. 314), a genre which it resembles only superficially. The pastoral grows out of a complex society in which the poet yearns nostalgically for unalloyed tranquillity; the tradition as he outlines it does not admit the overt social protest running through "Michael." Despite these and other weaknesses the volume is valuable for students of the eighteenth century. The accretion of evidence gives force to the evolution of pastoral theory and supplements knowledge of other aspects of eighteenth-century criticism.

EDWARD A. BLOOM

Brown University

Byron, Shelley and their Pisan Circle. By C. L. CLINE. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952. Pp. 263.

The Shelleys settled in Pisa in 1820 and around them an intellectual circle began to form, which included, at one time or another, Thomas Medwin, Jane and Edward Ellerker Williams, Emilia Viviani, Prince Alexander Mavrocordato (who left in June 1821, to become the first President of the new Greek republic) and an Irish emigré, John Taafe. In November 1821, Byron arrived and with him came the Countess Guiccioli and Count Gamba. With the arrival of Trelawny, friend of the Williamses, in January 1822, the circle was complete. Byron and Shelley were, of course, the leading figures. Of the others only Mary Shelley had had any notable literary success, but they all wrote, either then or later: Medwin, Trelawny, the Countess Guiccioli, Count Gamba, Williams, who wrote plays, and Taafe, who published bad poetry and a commentary on Dante.

It was a circle of writers. But it was a circle of rebels also. Byron and Shelley were virtual political exiles from England; Trelawny was a professional adventurer in revolt against accepted conventions in morals, religion and politics; Jane had left a husband behind her in India when she had gone off with the dashing Captain Williams (hunter of tigers as we learn from Taafe's manuscript autobiography); and Taafe had ended up in Italy as a result of a conflict with his family over an early common law marriage.

In his examination of this circle with its extraordinary diversity of talents and personalities Professor Cline has been able to unearth a surprising amount of unpublished material. The most important of it is a series of letters by Byron (largely relating to the Masi affair), but it includes also extracts from Taafe's autobiography and many of his letters as well as two brief excerpts from two of Shelley's letters to Taafe. By a skilful use of this material Professor Cline is able to give a good deal of new information on the circle and its activities. His treatment of the Masi affair is the most exhaustive yet attempted and his conclusion that Masi's assailant was Byron's coachman Papi seems to be sound. The Taafe material is dull reading but valuable for the light it throws on Shelley and Byron. One passage (p. 24) on Shelley is especially noteworthy and should take its place along with other unusual passages of first hand observation of him.

Professor Cline has worked hard and well in gathering this material. One could wish only that more investigation had been made into Italian sources (some of which he gives and some more of which are in Prothero's edition of Byron's letters and journals), and that he had included a ready reference list of unpublished material and material in a new text from manuscript sources.

The writing is generally lucid and the depiction of events clear. What is lacking is a sense of perspective. One gets little feeling of the greatness of Byron or Shelley, of their political or social rebellion, or even that they were poets. Yet it was at Pisa that Shelley wrote *Epipsychedion* and *Adonais* and *Hellas* and that Byron, fresh from the new brilliance of *A Vision of Judgement* and *Cain*, composed some of the finest cantos of *Don Juan*. The emphasis is almost entirely upon the new light thrown by the material upon surface biographical events, and the characters consequently tend to be treated too mechanically and on a single level with insufficient social, literary or psychological analysis.

KENNETH NEILL CAMERON

Carl H. Pforzheimer Library,
Purchase, N. Y.

Queen Anne's American Kings. By RICHMOND P. BOND. Oxford:
Clarendon Press, 1952. Pp. xii + 148. \$5.00.

In his Preface Mr. Bond speaks with appropriate modesty of his little study: "This volume . . . is the end of a diversion undertaken for personal amusement and relief from the chores of Academe and the doubts of war and peace, and pursued in the notion that the enjoyment a man may have of his main road can be enlarged by an excursion into a by-way." It shows evidence of being a seriously undertaken diversion, however. The reader must suppose, at the very least, that Mr. Bond took it seriously enough to think it worth publishing in the form he gives it; in any case, the present reviewer has tried to take it that seriously. There is, above all, a richness of data, supported by notes bulking roughly to one-third of the book, which sets us straight on the visit to Queen Anne in 1710 of four Iroquois sachems. Nonetheless, when *Queen Anne's American Kings* is read in terms of the form into which it has been cast, it turns out to be, at least for those of us who would concern ourselves with the meaning of such events as those of which it treats, the kind of diversion which simply cannot be taken seriously. That is to say, looking for an analysis of the relevance of these events to others, of the pattern of belief and action of which they are a part, of the part they play in the stream of our social and intellectual history, one finds only the richness of data unabsobered into any pattern of understanding. Taken as a whole, the study shows evidence of a misconceiving of the kind of form in which its subject should be presented, and so, in effect, of its subject.

What we are given is a detailed narrative of the visit, a survey of the affairs of church and state which it was to advance, and an

iconographic and bibliographical account of the works of the imagination, of all levels, which it inspired. Taken disparately, item by item, all this is admirably useful—especially when it is done with Mr. Bond's documentary expertness. But Mr. Bond obviously would have us take it as something more. For he makes this into a continuous and coherent account, so, apparently, to educe some meaning from all the data he so amusedly displays for us.

This, then, is a diversion into social and intellectual history, into *Geistesgeschichte* of a sort. As such, the principle by which it is held together and expounded, one reasonably may expect, should be an expression of the meaning that the author wants the events, from the political to the literary, to have for his readers. That principle here turns out to be a kind of associationism. An event is defined, in this expository mode, by being collocated chronologically, geographically, iconographically, or bibliographically with other events. Taken together, they make up the "texture" of the period; the texture, in fact, defines them even as they define it. But this way, one objects, only tautology lies. No ideological pattern is abstracted; no comparisons are made; for none are possible. In the end, we are given no operative understanding of the events, their significance, or their interrelatedness. There is no principle of relevance manifested, no principle of selection. Thus we are early told:

After their audience [with the Queen] the Kings were conducted back to their apartments at the "Two Crowns and Cushions" in King Street. This "very considerable and pleasant" way was hard by St. Paul's Church and led from the west into the spacious Covent Garden Square, which from the east received Russell Street, containing Will's Coffee-house, seat of the wits and Mr. Bickerstaff's poetical accounts. The sachems' host was an upholsterer, Thomas Arne, father of a month-old son who would make the music for "Rule, Britannia," and later of a daughter who became the singing actress and wife to Theophilus Cibber, son of the Laureate.

As exhibited here, the world of Mr. Bond's study, in spite of the names and events with which it is stuffed, is so small that no one has a name or a category, or is involved in an event or class of events, proper to himself. And this is the manner throughout. One gets no sense of form or pattern, so that one does not know just why Mr. Bond chose to convert all he could discover about these sachems and their English trip from a catalogue raisonnée to an essay such as this. Whatever life and significance the study as a whole has it gets from the explicit antiquarianism of the Preface.

In *Queen Anne's American Kings* Mr. Bond does not show evidence of taking his period very seriously. But he does seem fond enough of it. And he lets his fondness transform a diversion in bibliography into one in social and intellectual history. It seems to me, obviously, that the transformation is an abortive one,

because what I read as fondness is not enough for a task such as this. The scholar who sets out to interpret a series of events of significance in the life of a people should take the people seriously enough to try to understand the origin and nature of that significance. Sentimental positivism, if I may so call it, is not enough. Mr. Bond has given us data and events. Someone else will have to interpret them for us, so that the end of a serious diversion will be the high seriousness which even the quaint Augustans are entitled to.

ROY HARVEY PEARCE

Ohio State University

Tennyson and the Reviewers. By EDGAR FINLEY SHANNON, JR.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952. Pp. ix + 232.
\$4.00.

Biographers and literary historians tell us that Tennyson, like Shelley and Keats, was roughly handled by virtually all the early reviewers. "Seldom indeed," says Harold Nicolson, "has the critical community been so unanimous in condemnation." Professor Shannon, skeptical of sweeping statements on this and allied matters, has made a comprehensive study of Tennyson's reputation 1827-1851. The result, for obvious reasons, is not such an inclusive survey as Newman Ivey White made of Shelleyan criticism in *The Unexinguished Hearth*, where every contemporary reference to the poet is reproduced, but rather such an informed survey as Marsh and White made in their article on "Keats and the Periodicals of His Time." Searching out all available materials, particularly reviews in newspapers and provincial journals, Professor Shannon has added fifty-two items to the bibliography of Tennyson reviews and has established conclusively that the poet bent to the pressures which critics continued to exert upon him.

Taking up Tennyson's several collections seriatim, Professor Shannon opens his study by disagreeing with T. R. Lounsbury (with whom, indeed, he takes mild issue throughout) that the 1830 volume owed what favorable reviews it received to the puffing of the poet's friends, particularly the Cambridge "Apostles." However this may be, and the weight of evidence seems to tell against Lounsbury, nothing could save the 1833 volume from the poet's enemies. Croker, that destroyer of sensitive plants, took up his pen for the *Quarterly* with the announced intention of making of Tennyson "another Keats"; and William Jerdan in the *Literary Gazette* judged Tennyson insane, suggesting that the proper place for the author of "Oenone" was a padded cell. Nevertheless,

as Professor Shannon shows, Tennyson's genius did not go unappreciated, and the assumption of the blighting effect on Tennyson's reputation of the more scurrilous reviews is erroneous. Like Shelley, Tennyson was feared as a radical and thus not always reviewed strictly as a poet, the evidence for this odd suspicion consisting chiefly of enthusiastic critiques in the *Westminster Review*, the Benthamite journal.

In spite of the fact that there was frequent and generous recognition of his ability, Tennyson confessed to being "almost crushed" by abusive reviewers. Professor Shannon accepts the hypothesis that the ten years' silence (1833-1842) is chiefly indicative of Tennyson's reluctance to expose himself again to the critics. Meanwhile, however, he was undertaking the rigid discipline of revision, accepting with a sure critical sense stylistic objections which were not merely captious. About 60% of the passages to which exception had been taken in 1833 were altered for the 1842 volume, and the new poems showed Tennyson's active willingness to conform to suggestions. The metres were more familiar, the stanzas more regular, and the approach more moral and intellectual. On this last score there can be no doubt that the reviewers made themselves felt. Even Milnes, an ardent Tennysonian, reminded his friend in the *Westminster Review* that "the function of the poet in this day of ours" is "to teach still more than he delights." Professor Shannon remarks, "It is to be feared that Tennyson took this dictum too much to heart." But once he had done so, the critics did not hesitate (Lounsbury to the contrary notwithstanding) to acknowledge his achievement. With full citation Professor Shannon proves that "the story of critical neglect and popular acclaim in the face of recalcitrant reviewers is a myth."

By praising only his more solemn, less lyric strains, the critics changed the pattern of Tennyson's literary career. The cold reception of the "Morte d'Arthur," especially by John Sterling in the *Quarterly*, induced him to postpone for fifteen years serious work on his Arthurian epic. The vigor with which he was prepared to attack this subject in 1842 and which is so notably lacking in the *Idylls* leads Professor Shannon to the conclusion that here again the critics "perpetrated a lasting disservice of poetry." Professor Shannon also reads in *The Princess* a Tennysonian attempt to satisfy the demand that he grapple with a major problem of the age. Gerald Massey indicated the grounds of general approval of *The Princess* when he greeted it as "a song of Progress, timed to the beating pulses of the living Present." Yet there were many objections, and Professor Shannon points out at length the extent to which Tennyson exerted himself to meet the criticisms, particularly by the insertion of the beautiful intercalary songs. Not until *In Memoriam* did Tennyson win virtually unanimous ap-

proval. As the reviewer for the *Spectator* noted, "The volume is pervaded by a religious feeling and an ardent aspiration for the advancement of society."

Professor Shannon has marshaled a vast amount of material with adroitness and economy. The history of Tennyson's early reputation need never be done again. Though Professor Shannon's purposes are largely informational and statistical rather than critical, he has produced a survey so clean, compact, and orderly that one hopes he will push on to more demanding studies.

BRADFORD A. BOOTH

*University of California
at Los Angeles*

The Buried Life. A Study of the Relation Between Thackeray's Fiction and His Personal History. By GORDON N. RAY. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1952. Pp. vi + 148. \$2.75.

The editor of *The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepeace Thackeray* here publishes in expanded form lectures originally presented in the BBC third program and at the Lowell Institute. This thoroughly documented little monograph utilizes significant unpublished material: the Wellesley Papers in the British Museum and documents and other information made available by Thackeray's granddaughter and by collateral relatives of his stepfather, Major Carmichael-Smith. Professor Ray has also had access to Jane Brookfield's letters to her husband and to "most of the letters that she wrote to Thackeray," so that 'the affair Brookfield' is no longer matter for conjecture.

Even more interesting than the new material which *The Buried Life* utilizes is its methodology. This is of course not new, but it is here pursued to an extent and with a success not found in any work hitherto meeting this reviewer's eye. Professor Ray undertakes to account for the fact that of the novels of an author accorded first rank in the Victorian era, only *Vanity Fair*, and possibly *Henry Esmond*, today are widely read. The flaws which readers with preference for the "tough-minded literature" now current detect in Thackeray's art arise from his abandonment of his true metier. It is his sentimentalism chiefly from which this generation recoils, says Professor Ray, and he submits this ingredient of *Vanity Fair*, *Pendennis*, *Henry Esmond*, and *The Newcomes* to close examination. In so doing he chooses eight characters from these four major novels, and investigates the relationship between the originals on whom the characters were based and their imaginative portrayal. Here there is no resort to conjecture: five of the originals were

identified by Thackeray himself; the other three are convincingly traced to their biographical sources by Professor Ray. The originals are first presented and placed alongside their imaginative portrayals in the novel. There is then examination of the critical reception these portrayals have received.

It is Professor Ray's conviction that by nature and by nurture Thackeray was equipped to employ the "relatively objective realism" toward which he groped during his apprenticeship. Victorian critic and reader, on the other hand, demanded sympathetic character portrayals. Thackeray, mellowed by success and by concern for his daughters' future, yielded in *Vanity Fair* to these pressures. Seeking characters whom he could portray sympathetically, he had recourse to his "buried life," to his intimates for whom he did not maintain his detachment. Thus he was led, in shaping some of his major figures, to draw upon the succession of women in his life—his mother, his wife, Mrs. Brookfield, and his daughters. The characters based on intimates as originals are truthfully portrayed so far as their sayings and actions are concerned, but Thackeray's loyalties lead him to apologize for and to try to explain their shortcomings. The result for today's reader is the disparity between what these characters do and say and Thackeray's judgments of them, such as is found in *Amelia* and *Colonel Newcome*. When his loyalties are not engaged, he portrays consistent, well rounded characters, such as Jos Sedley and Major Pendennis, because he uses his gift of detachment. There were advantages to compensate to some extent for what he gave up in abandoning his metier, chief among which was ability to penetrate the personalities of his characters.

Students of Thackeray and of his era will find this little book biographically and critically rewarding.

JAMES L. HARLAN

Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College

The Alien Vision of Victorian Poetry. By E. D. H. JOHNSON.

Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952. Pp. xvi + 224.
\$4.00.

The subtitle of Professor Johnson's study indicates that it is an examination of the poetry of Tennyson, Browning and Arnold with a view to tracing the "sources" in them "of the poetic imagination." The main title suggests that the chief source of their imagination was something alien to the spirit of their time. The selves to the demands of Victorian culture, they were dividing general thesis of the book is that, in trying to accommodate themselves between their natural insights and the pressures of a society actually unfriendly to these. "Because, however hard they

tried, they could not simultaneously inhabit the worlds of the imagination and of Victorian society, a split opened, dividing the artistic awareness of Tennyson, Browning, and Arnold. The failure to close this breach confirmed the alienation of the modern artist." The suggestion seems to be that the poet of today, in his alienation from the reading public, inherits a state of being for which the great Victorians are largely responsible. One wonders what would be their relation to the world had the Victorian poets without compromise followed their native inspiration. Perhaps poetry would then have fulfilled the prophecies of Peacock and Macaulay and divorced itself so completely from the interests of intellectually disciplined readers as to become a subject of total indifference to them?

Mr. Johnson's thesis is bold and challenging, and will commend itself to an influential body of modern poets and critics. It might have been given even greater carrying power had the author allowed himself a glance at continental as well as English poetry—at Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Valéry, Rilke—and a glance, too, at modern prose fiction and at music and the plastic arts. Indeed, as a literary theory, it must take its place in the framework of comprehensive social phenomena which include universal education, the dominance of scientific realism in modern thought, and the general indifference of the man in the street to serious creative efforts in the arts.

In its general outlines, the thesis of the book is clearcut and forceful; and it is supported by a patient, scrupulous reading of the body of poetry indicated. Considered more in detail, it raises many questions in the mind of any reader with a rationalistic bias and a tolerance for "modern" attitudes. In forcing all three poets into the same terminological scheme, it sometimes gives the impression of semantic confusion. And often the argument rests upon assumptions, implied rather than stated, which a critical reader may question. With all his caution in generalizing about Victorian culture, Mr. Johnson's thesis virtually compels him to assume that the Victorian was more than other ages "cynically materialistic" and dominated by "the religion of hard facts that had put power in the hands of the Gradgrinds." Well! One must acknowledge that the early Utilitarians were proponents of the economic theory of laissez-faire, which is grounded in "the religion of hard facts." But the Utilitarianism of John Stuart Mill was progressively more and more a denial of Gradgrind assumptions, and the main trend of Victorian Liberalism was to put human values above property values. It is also true that Carlyle and Dickens, that Thackeray, Ruskin, Arnold and many others carried on perpetual warfare against the materialism of the age. But is not that in itself an indication that the spirit of the age was not inveterately materialistic? The special materialism of that age was in terms of machine production and capitalistic financing. But does that make it any

uglier than the materialism that created pauperism by the arbitrary enclosing of common lands, or that under which membership in the House of Commons could be bought up by the monied power of the landed gentry? Is there any good reason for assuming that the age that put down negro slavery and child labor was more materialistic than that of Sir Robert Walpole or that described in More's *Utopia*?

But here again, somewhere below the smooth surface of the discussion, there would seem to lurk the assumption that the nineteenth century was "materialistic" because—like the eighteenth, for that matter—it was "rationalistic," trying to reduce or eliminate the element of the supernatural in moral philosophy and religion. However, this is typical literary criticism of our time. It is conducted with so much verbal discretion that one would have to examine each term in many contexts to make out whether there was actually semantic confusion in its use.

Then there is the implied assumption that to "face outwards towards society" is a posture less promising for poetry than to "face inwards towards the life of the imagination." Tennyson was naturally disinclined towards society as subject-matter for poetry. The context might suggest that, when a poet takes society for his subject, or reflects social attitudes in his poems, he has somehow turned his back on "the life of the imagination." And we do not know how to reconcile this with the practice of Homer and Sophocles, of Shakespeare, Dryden, Pope, Wordsworth, Goethe, or with that of prose poets such as Tolstoy, Hardy, Proust, or Faulkner. If Tennyson's, or if Arnold's, native bent was for facing inwards, then we say, by all means let him follow his bent, and not try to write insipid idylls of English country life, or Idylls of the King, or "classical" epics on Balder, Rustum, Tristram and Iseult. But it does not follow that Tennyson's recourse to adolescent dreams, visions, or insanity, was his strong line, or one that most promised the revelation of spiritual truths. We recognize that Arnold, "facing inwards," dwells poignantly on the isolation of the individual soul, and in his very best poetry exploits the distress of a sensitive spirit trained in the old faith at being obliged to give it up. But what is more important to note is that Arnold's supreme gift is for subtle and closely reasoned prose "facing outwards towards society," in which he exhibits the two dominant traits of world literature since the renaissance, intellectual rationalism and idealistic humanism. He was the sharpest critic of what was mean and shabby in Victorian society, but he was at the same time quite at one with what was best and most promising in the spiritual culture of his age.

Perhaps the hardest case to fit into Mr. Johnson's scheme is that of Browning. Mr. Johnson shows clearly how Browning was at odds both with the rationalism of his time and with the social conventionalism so prevalent in his and all times; and then he shows how, paradoxi-

cally, Browning managed to please his contemporaries with poems recommending the intuitions of the heart as against both of these restrictive modes of thought. But Mr. Johnson also shows that, however much Browning relied on intuition for his ultimate inspiration, he repelled his Victorian readers, as he repels us, in both his early and his latest work, by his excessive dependence on the "rationalizing intellect" in the development of his theme. One might have supposed that his "rationalizing intellect," or at any rate his "rationalism," would have made him popular with his public. Perhaps one word is here being stretched to cover two distinct things. The fact would seem to be that Browning had by nature, along with his faith in natural emotion, or in the "intuition" that justifies it, an excessive penchant for intellectual and verbal hair-splitting, which interfered with his effectiveness as a poet; and that it was his dramatic power in exploiting the natural emotions that made him a good poet for his own and later times.

The questions here raised may serve to suggest at least certain reservations in regard to Mr. Johnson's theory as it stands. They may suggest that, on certain points, what prevented these poets from being more effectual than they were, was not so much their being at odds with the spirit of the age as their being at odds with themselves. Each one had his peculiar forte, through which he has endeared himself to generations of readers. And each one had, I suppose, a simple deficiency of poetic endowment in one direction or another.

JOSEPH WARREN BEACH

Minneapolis

The Age of Paradox: A Biography of England 1841-1851. By
JOHN W. DODDS. New York: Rhinehart and Co., 1952.
Pp. xvii + 509. \$6.00.

In an essay contributed to *The Reinterpretation of Victorian Literature* in 1951, Mr. Dodds outlined the qualities required for the writing of an ideal biography. Chief among these qualities was the capacity to "present truth palatably" so that "honest scholarship" could be combined with readability and "dramatic values." It is obvious that he has sought to live up to his own requirements in *The Age of Paradox*, an ambitious study of early Victorian social history which is referred to throughout as a "biography." Pleasantly written, copiously supplied with fact and anecdote, and enlivened with 192 well-selected illustrations, this book deserves to be enjoyed by the general reader. The specialized reader may lament the lack of more adequate documentation, and he may also find the "dramatic" contrasts occasionally excessive, for Mr. Dodds has a flair for setting up amusing juxtapositions. It must be remarked, however,

that one of the chief virtues of the book consists in the author's capacity to find the Victorians amusing or paradoxical rather than merely absurd. Unlike the Stracheyites, he avoids looking upon his subjects as fantastic specimens to be exhibited under glass in the historian's display-case; they are, for him, very much alive. Although he does have difficulty holding himself in when confronted by a Gothic engine-house or an epergne from the Great Exhibition, he is rarely critical. His tone of reasonable enquiry and his capacity to avoid any airs of twentieth-century superiority are admirable aspects of his interpretation.

One reason why Mr. Dodds may have found the decade congenial is his sharing in its Benthamite fondness for statistics. Even readers acquainted with such standard sources as Mayhew, the Hammonds, G. M. Young, or *The Annual Register*, will be astonished by the quantity of new data which have been assembled here from obscure newspapers, statistical reports, and other sources. The maximum speed reached by a Great Western railway train in 1848, the number of deaths from cholera in Scotland during the same year, the tonnage of the early Cunarders, how many editions of Disraeli's *Coningsby* were sold, the average number of people sharing a bed in a Manchester slum, or the number of corpses buried in the vicinity of St. Martin's church—the book bristles with such facts as these. Moreover, if the figures cited concerning the sale of books may serve as a test, the facts seem to have been recorded with accuracy and care.

In organizing his awe-provoking quantity of information, Mr. Dodds resorts to an unusual experiment. Perhaps taking his cue from the early novels of Dos Passos, he tries to present the decade as seen from the perspective of an ordinary Englishman of the period—how it strikes a contemporary. We are supposed to live *through* the decade as we read, and month by month, year by year, we watch the panorama unfold in a chronological order to which the author rigidly adheres. In such a perspective, plumbing and the disposal of sewage are more prominent topics than the literary qualities of Carlyle or Browning, and crime stories more prominent than the Oxford Movement. The life of any age or any person, says the author, is "compounded of jostling events ranging from the trivial to the profoundly important." Thus the fact that Atlantic ships kept a cow on board to provide milk for children may be sandwiched between such important events as the repeal of the Corn Laws or the appearance of the Communist Manifesto in 1848.

That a liveliness of narrative is obtained from this method is unquestionable. Also unquestionable is that the gain is made by sacrificing a certain amount of coherence. Despite the author's valiant attempts to impose a pattern upon his multitudinous materials, we are usually obliged to share "the confusion of these kaleidoscopic events" experienced by the early Victorians them-

selves. Sometimes we are swamped by a hodge-podge of fragmentary information. A strict adherence to chronology means that instead of an historical summary of the condition of the English stage from 1841 to 1851 for example (such as may be found in Allardyce Nicoll's chapter in *Early Victorian England*), we are provided with widely scattered glimpses of productions appearing at assorted theatres during different seasons throughout the decade.

One must add that the perspective does have a chastening effect upon the reader, which seems to have been the author's intention. By being forced to share the complexity of events, we are forced to become suspicious of the slick generalizations about Victorianism which are current in more conventional histories, especially in histories of literature. The excellence of the book thus rests, appropriately, upon a paradox. By avoiding the simplifications of conventional history, this lively and important study frustrates our demand for order. And yet, by the same method, it stimulates our awareness of the vitality and confused variety of a fascinating decade during which England stumbled from the "Hungry Forties" into the "Fabulous Fifties." The verb *stumbled* is not inappropriate to describe the transition which seems to be the major topic of the book. Of the year 1844, the author writes: "England, supported by a tremendous energy, a certain amount of good luck, and a kind of sinewy national character which was admired even by those outsiders who had little affection for it, muddled through into a new world, retaining her self-respect and gaining the world market simultaneously."

GEORGE H. FORD

University of Cincinnati

American Literary Criticism, 1900-1950. By CHARLES I. GLICKSBERG. New York, 1952. Pp. 574. \$5.00.

The "aim and justification" of this book, according to the Preface, "is primarily to give a cross-section of the critical ideas and methods employed by various eminent and representative critics during the past fifty years." Twenty-seven critics are represented in the work, all but one of them (Brownell) by one selection each. A long introduction surveys modern American criticism, attempting to "make modern literary trends understandable through the mediation of the historical approach." In contrast, then, to such recent critical anthologies as those of Robert Stallman and Mark Schorer, which get their organizing principles from within the new criticism itself, this volume finds its categories outside criticism, in history.

Accordingly, Mr. Glicksberg tries to be impartial in treating his twenty-seven critics, who represent, one judges from his Introduc-

tion, almost as many different kinds of criticism. Except for the past quarter century of Mr. Eliot's criticism and the whole Humanist movement, he seems to see all the different methods as valid because they filled some need of the time. He reminds us repeatedly that "A critical judgment is an act . . . committed by someone at some time. . . . Thus, criticism does not proceed in a vacuum but . . . within a sociological matrix." Approaching the subject from this point of view, he insists, enables us to find a "recognizable pattern," to "make some semblance of order" out of "seeming confusion and heterogeneity."

Such an approach is certainly legitimate, though one may question whether it is the most profitable one at the present time. There are insights which only such an extrinsic approach to criticism can make available, though it seems to me unlikely that treating only *American* criticism, thus considering Eliot for example in isolation from Richards and Spingarn from Croce, is the best way to make them available. A historical approach to criticism demands attention to context, and the context of modern American criticism is modern European criticism and philosophy just as surely as it is American social conditions.

But even such historical insights as might emerge despite this limitation do not emerge in this book, and for several reasons. First, it is not clear for whom Mr. Glicksberg is writing. Sometimes it is apparently for those who have not yet realized that what is new today is old tomorrow and that history is not one dimensional: "The character of 'newness' obviously changes constantly in relation to the whirligig of time. . . . Modernism was an amalgam of many complex forces and tendencies." At other times he appears to be aiming at the reader to whom the mere mention of the name of Nietzsche or Jung will be sufficient to characterize a whole movement or constellation of ideas.

Second, though Mr. Glicksberg tries hard to be fair to ideas and critics he is not in sympathy with, yet his method frequently fails him at the very point where it should be strongest, in describing critical movements that lie outside his own frame of reference. We sense the effort to be judicious when we find him denying that the fact that Eliot's essays first appeared in periodicals is a sufficient reason for dismissing him as a serious critic, or when we find him trying to balance the pros and cons together in one sentence: "Whether or not one agrees with Eliot's critical method and his evaluation of literature, it is impossible not to acknowledge the high seriousness, the profound insight, and the sound scholarship which inform his work, at least before he was led astray by theological absolutes." But the Humanist movement must not have filled a need of the time, for we find that the judgment here is unambiguously negative: "Humanism, denying the reality of the natural order, rejects the concept of the natural man and the idea of the continuity of experience." There is no time to comment on the

lack of information and the several types of logical confusion reflected in this, but one may ask briefly *which* humanists deny the "reality" of the natural order. Could it be More, Babbitt, or Foerster that Mr. Glicksberg has in mind? We may infer the cause of, if not the evidence for, the judgment when we read that "the Humanist movement was as a whole utterly out of touch with the vital issues confronting the modern mind."

Finally, despite repeated promises to show us the "pattern" in recent criticism, Mr. Glicksberg seems unable to make his historical method work for him to the extent of exhibiting any pattern. Long lists of names, each one followed by a descriptive phrase, do not constitute a pattern. Mr. Glicksberg would appear to be recognizing his difficulty when he says that "American literary criticism of the twentieth century seems to reveal no clear-cut line of progression," and again, "It is difficult to discover a single, continuing pattern, a steady flow of what might be called 'progress.'" It would have been franker of Mr. Glicksberg to say not "difficult" but "impossible."

Since the critical essays that follow the Introduction are all available elsewhere, it is not clear what value if any the book has.

HYATT H. WAGGONER

The University of Kansas City

Geschichte der Amerikanischen Literatur. By HENRY LÜDEKE.

Bern: A. Francke, [1952.] Pp. 653. Fr. 15.40.

Professor Lüdeke's history is the most competent and thorough survey of American literature that has as yet appeared in the German language. It sketches the lives of authors, outlines the history of their chief books, pays its respects systematically to sources and influences, and subordinates literary criticism to the narration of fact. In method and style it continues the hoary tradition of Germanic scholarship. To German-speaking students who in increasing numbers are listening to university lectures in "Amerikanistics" it will no doubt prove to be a boon. The fairly extensive bibliographies at the end of the volume will also be useful in directing the foreign reader to other works dealing either with the social background or the literature of the United States. While these bibliographies are marred by a few misprints or other inaccuracies and repeat certain titles from *Literary History of the United States* which are of little or no value, they are clearly organized and for the most part up to date. By way of exception to the last-mentioned point, it might be noted that the new editions of certain standard works like Mott's *History of Newspapers* and

Curti's *American Thought* are not mentioned; nor is the most substantial one-volume history of American literature, namely, *The Literature of the American People*, edited by A. H. Quinn.

American readers will be interested especially in the wide assortment of minor figures whom Professor Lüdeke manages to weave into his pattern without distracting emphasis from the major authors. Some of the details add up to little, but occasionally, as in the discussion of Robert Herrick, the passages on the minor writers command authority. This study bears in mind the contribution of the Negro and of the South as well as the North, and only rarely do the methods of arrangement contrast sharply with the traditional approaches. The scope and compass of the book make it difficult to isolate particular features for praise, but, if the present reviewer's impressions are correct, the sections on Cooper, Poe, and Emerson appear to have unusual original lustre. Occasionally one notes an idea or attitude more characteristic of a European student of our letters than of an American specialist, but one is struck by the relatively slight reference to European authorities in the bibliography. Probably Professor Lüdeke, with his own American background, recognizes very little European scholarship on American literature or social history as comparable in merit with the native product. His book, however, may well prove to be a concrete augury of a coming change.

Of the several portraits of authors used as illustrations—all well selected—attention should be called to the picture of Bryant (facing page 113) which reproduces a painting by a Swiss artist, Frank Buchser, that deserves to be better known in this country.

CLARENCE GOHDES

Duke University

Victorian Knight Errant. A Study of the Early Literary Career of James Russell Lowell. By LEON HOWARD. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1952. x + 388 pp. \$5.00.

Professor Howard has made excellent use of a multitude of Lowell's manuscripts to present new biographical facts, his peculiar habits of composition and revision, his early confusions and indecisions, and especially the sources of his main ideas. Emphasis is placed on the influence of Dugald Stewart and James Mackintosh in giving Lowell his early cult of sympathy and emotionalism, and Mr. Howard shows in a masterful way how these men, with some help from Coleridge and others, gave Lowell his central concept of the imagination as developed in his lectures of 1855. This imagination is regarded as "the power of unrestricted sym-

pathetic identification of himself with others," and Lowell thought Shakespeare illustrated its workings best. The book concludes by "six critical terms or categories" which dictated his later literary criticism:

They referred primarily to the capabilities of a writer, who was required to possess such fundamental qualities as an active 'fancy' and a factual 'understanding' in order to collect and use the materials from which literature was formed. These materials might be shaped by the structural 'poetic faculty' or informed by the 'poetic sense,' but before they could be turned into the highest form of literature they had to be transformed by an 'imagination' which could be either 'narrative' or, at its best, 'dramatic.' No single work of literature could be characterized by a display of all six of these qualities, but a consideration of any piece of writing with reference to them would enable a critic to make a thorough diagnosis of its merits and shortcomings. (p. 348)

Mr. Howard does his best work in his month by month analysis of Lowell's changing aims and his struggle to overcome the vagueness and mistiness which Elizabeth Barrett found in his early poems. Perhaps Mr. Howard's personal view that Lowell's sympathetic "tendency to lose himself in other people" and their troubles is among the chief "faults of his philosophy" accounts for his tendency to treat Lowell's writings on abolition with less sympathetic emphasis than some readers may wish. But on the whole the book is packed with all sorts of fresh insights and shrewd detective work based on the original manuscripts, and it is especially good in relating Lowell to the magazines of the period and the actual conditions which he faced as a writer and man.

HARRY HAYDEN CLARK

University of Wisconsin

Howells and Italy. By JAMES L. WOODRESS. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1952. Pp. xv + 223. \$3.50.

From a wide variety of published and unpublished sources, Mr. Woodress has traced the vein of Italianism throughout Howells's career with interesting results in both literary biography and comparative cultural history. In biography he has thrown much light on certain neglected phases of Howells's life and literary methods; in the second field, however, his effort to show that the Italian influence upon Howells was a major one and therefore an important aspect of international literary relations is somewhat less convincing.

We may be especially grateful for the carefully detailed account of Howells's early life as consul in Venice from 1861-1865 and the part it played in changing him from an aspiring and unsuccessful poet into a mature critic and prose writer. With imagina-

tion and insight Mr. Woodress has interpreted the importance of those years in Howells's life. He shows clearly, for instance, that the letter from Lowell in 1864 praising Howells's article on "Modern Italian Comedy" was a turning point in his career, helping to make possible the "leap from Columbus to Boston, from the *Ohio State Journal* to the *Atlantic Monthly*." Of almost equal interest is the close study of Howells's literary use of his Italian experience, the care with which he kept travel notes, and the intimate correlation between his creative activity and his personal experience. Such books as *Venetian Life*, *Italian Journeys*, and *Tuscan Cities* with their skillful blending of history and contemporary reporting raised the level of the travelogue and created an original type.

Mr. Woodress has presented detailed information on the origin and evolution of these books, as well as the Italian novels such as *A Foregone Conclusion*, *Indian Summer*, and others. His discussion of the novels suggests that similar methods would greatly enlighten us upon Howells's major fiction of the 1880's. We have heard much of Howells's theories of realism, his "genteelism," and his humanitarian sympathies, but his artistic methods in fiction and his use of source material have been largely neglected. Although it is unlikely that the notebooks of Howells, if they could be found, would prove as fruitful a study as those of Henry James, one cannot help feeling that his methods of gathering material and his literary exploitation of his own life played a larger part in Howells's development as a realistic writer than did his better known "official" editorial pronouncements in *Criticism and Fiction* and elsewhere. Mr. Woodress sins a little by omission when he asserts that Goldoni played "an important part in shaping Howells's theory of Realism in fiction," because that rather loosely-defined aesthetic philosophy drew from many other sources besides the Italian dramatist and his theories of fiction usually followed his successful practise in novel writing.

As a study in Italo-American literary relations, *Howells and Italy* is a compendium of important and not-so-important information. It suffers some from a too zealous inclusion of everything Italian in Howells's long career. There can be no doubting the "frequent and extended use of his Italian experience," but the use of statistical and bibliographical summaries to "prove" the extent of Howells's Italianism overemphasizes quantitative measurement as a yardstick of literary influence. Howells's "predilection for Italy" did not markedly affect his major work as a novelist. Italy was a lifelong interest, as Mr. Woodress has amply shown, but its direct influence upon Howells's writing was limited (with one or two important exceptions) to the travel books, certain critical articles, and the dramatic sketches.

ROBERT P. FALK

*University of California,
Los Angeles*

The Continuations of the Old French "Perceval" of Chrétien de Troyes, Vol. III, Part 1: The First Continuation—Redaction of MSS ALPRS. Edited by WILLIAM J. ROACH. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1952. Pp. xi + 693.

Volume III (Part 1) of Roach's huge *Perceval* edition concludes the establishment of texts for the First, or "Pseudo-Wauchier," Continuation of Chrétien's unfinished poem. Together with variant tables which control over ten thousand verses, the several texts published here as representing the ALPRS redaction involve nearly 22,000 octosyllabic lines.

The four-page preface which begins this volume is already so compact that summary would be virtual fac-simile. What Roach calls the Short Redaction of the First Continuation is now published in full, as transmitted by manuscripts ALR with variants from PS throughout, and with those U variants which correspond to vv. 2639-6798 in A. The text of R (pp. 603-638) is a fragment of 1405 lines corresponding to vv. 1-1130 in A. The second part of Volume III is to contain M. Lucien Foulet's glossary for all texts of the First Continuation. This impressive contribution is to be followed later by the remainder of the critical commentary, without which detailed reviews of Roach's work to date are not yet readily feasible (R. van Waard to the contrary: *ZRPh*, 68 [1952], 460-464). The ALPRS redaction is followed by eighteen pages of excellent textual and palaeographic annotations, and by an index of the proper names in manuscripts ALR. Only a few of these notes seem to invite comment in the light of presently available data, so that nothing is attempted here beyond tentative solutions for three unexplained passages in manuscript R.

Roach correctly points out (p. 641) that R offers, in its vv. 849-53, a passage which "has no parallel in any other manuscript" and which indicates beyond doubt that Envy would not dare to defame Gawain. The complete sentence, with parentheses to show the orthographic changes suggested here, reads as follows in the edition:

- 845 Envie, qui ne puet amer
Les bons ne laissier a blamer,
N'est si ose ne si hardie
Q'oiant nului nul mal en die,
- 849 Car trop en seroit siue (*read si, or chose?*) aperte
Et trop en seroit descouverte
De solement un mot sentir,
Et si seroit (*read saroit*) cil desmentir
- 853 De qanqu'il (*read qanqu'el*) a mesdit en ça
Puis que li siecle comança
Et seroit del tot mescreüe,
Jamais jor ne seroit creüe
- 857 Por rien que ele seüst dire.

Beginning with v. 849, the five awkward verses might seem to mean: "For in this Envy would be so impudent, and she would be thoroughly unmasked were she only to breathe a single word; and he [Gawain] would be able to give the lie to every slander she has spoken up to now." Perhaps the copyist bungled in more than what is implied by the few changes suggested above, but at seven-century distance anything more than minimum emendation would only multiply speculation, while leaving certainty as indeterminate as zero over zero.

The sense of R in vv. 1021-24 is not easy to establish, and Roach decides (p. 642) that "since no other MS contains this passage and since possible corrections are not obvious, it has been left unchanged." In the light of the adjacent context, however, it seems possible to arrive at a solution without altering the mediaeval text:

- 1019 *Li cuer enfondent molt et ardent*
A tex vint mil qui les aguardent,
Si fait il plus qu'a trente mile.
Onques mains dels ne fu sans gille,
 1023 *Ce vos di bien, qui n'en a point,*
Ains en font mains qu'il ne lor point;
Ne l'osent faire ne nel voelent,
Ne en tel lieu faire nel soelent.
Ice n'est pas mellee en rue,
 1028 *La ou l'om brait et la ou rue.*

The *si fait il* (*il* impersonal) of v. 1021 seems to repeat v. 1019, with the idea that the grief of the twenty-odd thousand who are watching the combat between Gawain and Guiromelant is in reality even more intense than if these spectators were half again as numerous. This is borne out particularly in vv. 1035-36, where "all other sorrows are wordless and vain beside the sorrow they feel for Gawain." Furthermore, vv. 1031-32 give the reminder that "the less flame a fire gives off, the more burning and painful it is." This gives the impression that in vv. 1022-28 the onlookers are suffering so deeply that their feelings are not to be betrayed in vulgar show. Hence the suggested translation: "This I tell you surely, that, (even in the eyes of anyone) who feels no grief, never has grief been displayed less without guile [i. e., never with more restraint]. But they [the onlookers] show their grief in less degree than it is hurting them: they dare not let it be seen nor do they want it to be, nor is it their custom (to break down) in such a situation. This is no street fight where people 'bray' and brawl."

In vv. 1058-1209, manuscript R alone introduces a debate in which Reason would persuade Clarissent to be more concerned for her brother Gawain than for her lover (Guiromelant) whom Gawain has just killed in single combat, whereas Love would have her place grief for Guiromelant ahead of everything else. Through v. 1134, Reason and Love address their arguments to Clarissent,

but thereafter, in the passages (vv. 1137-38, 1144-50) which Roach properly calls obscure and almost certainly corrupt (p. 643), the confusion is perhaps little more than a matter of pronouns:

- 1135 Amors respont: "Si m'aît Dex!
Mais puis que mes freres est tiex
Que molt est prous, ce li covent
Ses amis que si bien se tient."
- 1139 Oiés com amors la deçoit.
Et raisons, qui bien l'aperçoit:
"Or soit qu'il soit altresi ber,
Doi jo le por ce tant amer?"
- 1143 Nenil, non, voir, de la moitié.
S'il le sert, mal a exploité;
Gart qu'il ne sace en nule guise.
Entre deus preus a grant devise;
- 1147 Proëce n'est pas tout en couz,
Car dont en seroit siens li frous.
Proëce d'armes solement
- 1150 Est sece et çingle voirement.

Except obviously in vv. 1139-40, the interpolator-author intends perhaps that Clarissent shall be the speaker in the above passage, and that she shall speak now as from Love (vv. 1135-38) and now as from Reason (v. 1141 ff.). But during a verse or two, the pronouns are too mixed up to show whether the beginning lines of the passage represent Clarissent soliloquizing her "problem," or whether the R-redactor is continuing the Reason-Love polemic even through v. 1141. In any case, from v. 1142 on, the versifier is putting all the relevant verbs and pronouns in the first person (Clarissent). Consequently, it may be that only two words invite emendation: *ses* 1138 to *mes* (because *ses amis* has to be Guiromelant), and *sert* 1144 to *set* or *sot* (because of *sace* 1145, from *sapiat*). Regardless of the precise point at which the Old French originally placed the beginning of Clarissent's soliloquy, vv. 1135-48 may be paraphrased freely, somewhat as follows:

"So help me God, Love tells me that, while my brother Gawain is so very valiant, my own beloved matches him in worth [ce 1137 = impersonal *il?*] because he conducts himself with such honor." You hear, gentle listener, how Clarissent's love is deceiving her. And now her reason, quite perceptive, makes her say: "Now let's suppose Guiromelant is as fine as I know he is: ought I to love him so dearly just for that? No, truly, no, not even half as much. If Guiromelant only knew it, it was a mistake for him to fight Gawain, but may I keep him from ever finding out in any way that I think so [it is easy to imagine that the poet is making Clarissent speak in her grief as if Guiromelant is still living]. Instead of fighting each other, two such valiant knights could have joined forces 'in great device,' in wondrous wise. Chivalry isn't all in tilting and blows, for if such were the case the reward of prowess would be meaningless."

In v. 1148, *frous* is presumably one of the Godefroy variants (iv, 153c) for the *fro* which he explains as "terre inculte et abandonnée"; and *siens* must obviously refer to *proëce*. While vv. 1149-50 are an evident repetition of the sense in 1147-48, the literal mean-

ing of *sece et çaingle* is yet to be established categorically. Since R is the work of a Picard copyist, it is easy to assume that *sece* = "sèche." If so, then *çaingle* is also an adjective, to be linked with *singul-*. Thus v. 1150 would qualify military prowess by itself as but a single and sterile facet in chivalry. A more forced interpretation might admit *sece* and *çaingle* as nouns, to be identified possibly with *ces(se)* = "negation" (cf. Godefroy, II, 25c) and *cengle* = "walling in" (hence "curtailment" or "limitation"? cf. Tobler-Lommatsch, II, 111). It is obviously more reasonable to construe the two words as adjectives.

University of Michigan

EDWARD B. HAM

Théâtre de Racine. Texte établi et annoté par PIERRE MÉLÈSE.
5 volumes. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale de France, 1951-
1952. Pp. 1812.

After a three-page foreword by M. René Groos, literary director of the series, this important work consists of contributions by M. Mélèse: a life of Racine, an extensive bibliography, an iconography, the text of the plays with prefatory comments, and in Vol. v, notes on the eleven tragedies and *les Plaideurs*. Several documents of interest to readers of the plays are also reproduced: Racine's sketch of *Iphigénie en Tauride*, his notes on *Athalie*, Saint-Evremond's *Dissertation sur le Grand Alexandre*, and passages from Rotrou's *Antigone*, Subligny's *Folle Querelle*, Boursault's *Artémise et Polianthe*, Garnier's *Hippolyte*, Quinault's *Bellérophon*, and Pradon's *Phèdre et Hippolyte*. The fifth volume contains an *Index grammatical* and a *Lexique* of words used in what are now unusual ways. One is impressed by the care displayed in the composition of these volumes and by M. Mélèse's extensive command of contributions to the study of Racine, by no means confined to those written in France. So far as the plays are concerned, this edition should supersede that of Paul Mesnard.

It is very attractively printed, with occasional symbolic illustrations. To spare the reader the unsightliness of numbers that follow every fifth or tenth line and at the same time to satisfy scholars who wish to quote Racine, such numbers are eliminated, with the exception of one in red that is placed after the first verse on each page of text. As there are seldom more than twenty-five lines to a page, usually many less, the method presents little difficulty to one who wishes to quote a verse.

In general I am quite in agreement with M. Mélèse's remarks, but I think that occasionally he puts too much reliance upon Louis Racine (I, 23, 37). In regard to his mention of *Sertorius* (I, 33), of M. Aussoleil (II, 16), and of *Don Carlos* (III, 226), I should like

to refer him to what I have written in my *History*, Part III, p. 493, n. 8, and Part IV, pp. 56 and 85. He says (I, 27, n. 1) that there exists no tragedy by Boyer called *la Thébaïde* and that a reference to one may be to his "Antigone, qui ne fut d'ailleurs jouée qu'en 1686". But this last play is by Pader d'Assézan. There is, however, another *Antigone* that may be by Boyer.¹ I, 46, for *Albikrach* read *Albikrac*. I, 54, to propose a common source does not explain the simultaneous production of the two *Bérénice* tragedies, but, if such sources are to be mentioned, why overlook Magnon's *Tite*, a tragedy of 1660? I, 70, n. 1, if it is to be recorded that, in *Iphigénie*, Champmeslé had the role of Agamemnon in 1685, it would be well to add that at that time Achilles was played by Baron, Ulysses by La Tuillerie, Clytemnestra by La Beauval, and that it is probable that they created these roles, for they were all members of the troupe of the Hôtel in 1674. I, 92-93, I do not understand why he rejects the parallel Vashti-Montespan, although he accepts Esther-Maintenon and thinks that, in composing *Bérénice*, Racine may have thought of Louis XIV and Marie Mancini, perhaps also of M^{me} de La Vallière.² I, 118, n. 1, "Tiridate eut vingt-cinq représentations en 1691, grâce, il faut le dire, à l'interprétation de Baron." According to the *Registres* of the Comédie Française, it had thirty-two performances in 1691, the last of which was given on Nov. 10, after Baron's retirement; as this last performance attracted 1135 paying spectators, whereas no earlier performance had brought to the theater over 854, it cannot easily be established that the success of the tragedy was due to Baron. II, 21, the Italian translation of *Andromaque* given here as anonymous is attributed to Eustachio Manfredi in a manuscript note that seemed trustworthy to Ferrari.³ III, 114, for Daubray read Dalibray. IV, 13-16, I should like to see more than a passing reference to Eriphile, the most original character in *Iphigénie*, and a quotation from the *Mémoire de Mahelot* in regard to the setting, one that is much more informative than the notice of *Phèdre*, quoted on IV, 123. V, 234, it would have been interesting to note that Leconte de Lisle considered v. 1444 of *Britannicus* his ideal of poetic beauty.⁴ V, 234, lines 25-29, add that, according to the *Gazette*, Louis XIV danced in *les Amants magnifiques* on Feb. 4, 1670, after *Britannicus* is supposed to have made him renounce participation in ballets.

These are all minor matters that detract little from the excellence of this edition, which should be in all libraries with readers who are taking a serious interest in French literature.

H. C. LANCASTER

¹ Cf. my *op. cit.*, Part IV, pp. 170-172.

² III, 14. On the other hand, I am glad that he dismisses as untenable M. Charlier's theory in regard to the conception of *Athalie*; cf. V, 14.

³ *Le Traduzioni italiane del teatro tragico francese*, Paris, 1925, p. 29; see this work for other Italian translations of Racine's tragedies.

⁴ Cf. Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française*, XIII, 248.

Nietzsche and the French. A Study of the Influence of Nietzsche's French Reading on his Thought and Writing. By W. D. WILLIAMS. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952. Pp. xxi + 206.

Although we have long been aware of Nietzsche's great debt to French culture we have lacked until now a study such as Mr. Williams' which shows how Nietzsche's deep study of French literature of the last 3 centuries was one of the major determinants in the formation of his final philosophical attitude. Mr. Williams offers even more, showing how this same study of French literature was intimately connected with all the various stages in the development of Nietzsche's very complex personality.

From his many references to French literature in his works, it is evident that Nietzsche was not only well acquainted with it, but that he saw in it the perfect expression of the vicissitudes, joys, and triumphs of the whole European cultural tradition. At the same time, however, he sensed in it symptoms of the degeneration of that tradition. Thus even while he pinned his hopes to it as the pinnacle of Western cultural achievement, he was obliged to admit that it was moving in the same direction as the rest of Western culture, in the direction of decadence. This realization was of course disillusioning, but Nietzsche's love of French culture was sufficiently deep to survive even disillusionment. France remained for him always the citadel of "Vornehmheit."

What attracted Nietzsche to French culture in particular was the ability of the French to combine the most Catholic and Christian tradition in Europe with an almost aristocratic cult of strong personal and individual values. Mr. Williams suggests that it was this paradoxical contradiction in the French spirit, the fact that it was broad and rich enough to carry both components, which explains the extraordinary fascination which it had for Nietzsche. Whatever the explanation, the fascination was great, for though other ideals, other men such as Wagner, Schopenhauer, absorbed him for a time, it was the French and not the Germans who shared with the Greeks the distinction of being a truly determining influence on Nietzsche's thought throughout his life.

Mr. Williams' study is divided into three sections. The first, entitled *From Aesthetic Pessimism to Scepticism*, deals with the development of Nietzsche's thought from 1869 to 1876. This period was characterized at the outset by an enthusiasm for Greek civilization coupled with an aesthetic and tragic attitude toward life which is "compounded of Nietzsche's own native romantic sensibility and the determinative influence of Schopenhauer and Wagner." The chief French writers who influenced Nietzsche's thought during this period were Rousseau and Montaigne. The former left hardly any mark at this time, being still largely a figure upon whom Nietz-

sche heaps scorn and hatred. The *Essais* of the latter, however, were of great importance during the writing of the *Unzeitgemäße Betrachtungen*, for they led Nietzsche to a new attitude "curiously similar to the unworried scepticism of Montaigne and helped as well to encourage a bent toward ethical concern which was beginning to develop in Nietzsche during the Basel years." Nietzsche was likewise impressed during this period by Voltaire's renunciation of the task of searching for ultimate truth and his limitation of himself to the sphere of what can be known and not merely believed; and as Williams points out, Voltaire was certainly an important influence in Nietzsche's turning at this time from the mysticism of his early period to the positivism of his middle period.

After having "settled with" Schopenhauer and Wagner and having put his earlier ideals behind him, Nietzsche entered a period of scepticism which Mr. Williams dates from 1876-1882. In this period of unabashed positivism Nietzsche was sharply critical of all idealism and substituted the search for truth for his earlier belief in the creation of beauty as man's highest activity. In the formation of the new scientific ideal of the freely inquiring spirit, Voltaire the enlightener was Nietzsche's champion. Nietzsche admired almost equally in Voltaire, however, his successful aesthetic approach to life as the artist who imposed form upon the chaos of raw experience, who created harmony by imposing form and measure. Nietzsche cultivated La Rochefoucauld with almost equal assiduousness at this time, for he was obsessed during his period of scepticism by the divergence between reality and appearance which is the basis of La Rochefoucauld's view of society. Mr. Williams brings out that Nietzsche's development of the aphoristic form may well have been inspired by his enthusiastic admiration for La Rochefoucauld's wit and precision of form as they are combined in the aphorism. Yet a third writer, Pascal, interested Nietzsche during his period of skepticism. He was not ready as yet, however, to come to terms with Pascal as an exponent of Christianity and drew on him at this time simply as a critic of society and of human psychology.

During the final period of Nietzsche's development which Mr. Williams sees as running from 1882 to 1888, the great doctrines generally associated with his teachings, the superman, the idea of eternal recurrence, the double system of morality, the division of mankind into lords and slaves, the concept of life as the will to power, all received their final formulation. In this period Rousseau, Montaigne, Pascal, La Rochefoucauld were still Nietzsche's faithful guides, and a new enthusiasm began to develop for Stendhal. With the application of Nietzsche's new principle in his subsequent writings there went hand in hand, as Mr. Williams shows, an enormous increase in his French reading. New writers, Vigny, de Lisle, Prudhomme, Merimée, Taine, Bourget, came into his ken, but while he turned attention particularly to modern French literature, and

especially to the psychological writers of the 19th century, still Nietzsche continued to find his earlier guides of great value and there is no apparent diminution in these years of his reading of Montaigne, Pascal, La Rochefoucauld, Rousseau. During this most important period in his creative life Nietzsche thus remained an ardent and assiduous student of French literature, especially of those writers who discuss problems of psychology and its relation to moral philosophy.

Although Mr. Williams shows by many detailed comparisons between Nietzsche's writings of his various periods and those of his French guides that Nietzsche derived many of his ideas about culture and decadence and found inspiration and substantiation for many of his master concepts in the works of the various French writers whom he admired, he is always careful to make it quite clear that a number of other influences were likewise at work at every stage of Nietzsche's complicated intellectual development. He is equally at pains to show that it is an error to regard Nietzsche's thought as a mere synthesis of ideas and concepts garnered from the writings of others. What he seeks to prove and does in effect prove is that Nietzsche's readings in French literature had two major effects. In the first place, these readings compensated for the personal experiences so necessary to an understanding of human psychology which were lacking in Nietzsche's life. From them Nietzsche derived insight into human psychology, and stimulated by them he became a keen observer of human behaviour. The second influence is an outgrowth of the first in the sense that Nietzsche's readings caused him to deviate from the pattern of theoretical speculation so characteristic of German philosophy. The French, then, brought Nietzsche down to earth, as it were, by stimulating his interest in human psychology and deepening his psychological perception. In so doing, concludes Mr. Williams, they helped him to arrive at a manner of envisioning reality in which the abstract thinking of the German is supplemented by the concrete immediate insights of the Frenchman.

Mr. Williams deserves special commendation for the excellent presentation of his study. One is impressed both by the organization of the subject matter and the eminently readable style of the book. Additional commendable features are the inclusion of complete translations of all passages quoted in German and the informative foot-notes. In many of these latter very interesting bits of information are tucked away, as for example in the footnote on page 30 which cites Voltaire as the source of the dancer symbol to characterize the free activity of the thinker which Nietzsche employed in his *Zarathustra*. The index of the book has been carefully made, and the author has furnished too, a good selective bibliography which lists in addition to Nietzsche's writings, the best of the memoirs on Nietzsche by his friends, and the leading critical works

on his life and thought. Only one omission in the bibliography struck this reviewer as peculiar, and that is Mr. Williams' failure to include what is probably the finest of recent studies on Nietzsche, that of Walter Kaufmann (Princeton University Press). The conclusion, which is both well-drawn and lucidly expressed, offers a succinct summary of the results of Mr. Williams' investigation. The study may thus be recommended both as a fine example of scholarly criticism and as a valuable contribution to the existing literature on Nietzsche, for it presents in the most attractive possible manner the complete picture, which we have lacked heretofore, of the deep and formative influence of French literature on Nietzsche's thought and development.

WILLIAM H. McCCLAIN

The Johns Hopkins University

Publicaciones periodísticas de don Ramón del Valle-Inclán anteriores a 1895. Edición, estudio preliminar y notas de WILLIAM L. FICHTER. México: El Colegio de México, 1952. Pp. 222.

Ramón del Valle y de la Peña created some memorable characters in his time, but none could compare with the unwritten fictionalization of himself as Don Ramón María del Valle-Inclán, the very name a wonderful hendecasyllable. The exploits of this person soon became legendary—and incredible. He lived the kind of life for which the Spaniards have a name, *estrambótica*. In giving the world to understand that he, Don Ramón, was a hero, a dissolute character, and a cultivator of magnificent *actes gratuits*, he fooled nobody, but he succeeded in raising an almost impenetrable dust-storm around the truth.

Most writers belonging to his generation, of course, posed: Azorín, Baroja, Unamuno. . . . They fictionalized their lives, since they were not satisfied with their written fiction. The legends thus created threaten to outlive the writing. Most Spanish critics still prefer to recount anecdotes told them by Don Fulano in the café Gijón or the Gato Negro, rather than pass judgment on his prose. It would be a pity if such critics won the day, for there is much that is of value in twentieth-century Spanish writing. Spaniards, unwilling to give the least offense to a compatriot, will be slow in dissociating the personality of the man from the personality of the writer. The onus of doing this is thus shifted to foreign Hispanists.

A scholar like Mr. Fichter, well grounded in the discipline of sorting the true and the false in the older literature of Spain, is admirably fitted to find the real Valle-Inclán behind the dust-cloud. He has previously demonstrated an interest in the genesis of Valle-Inclán's style and a rare ability to translate research into criticism

in his "Primicias estilísticas de Valle-Inclán" (*Revista Hispánica Moderna*, viii, 293). This preliminary study and the book under review, taken with the stylistic investigations of Amado Alonso, Pedro Salinas, and Alonso Zamora Vicente, make Valle-Inclán, in spite of his efforts to cloud the issue, one of the best understood writers of twentieth-century Spain.

Fichter, working part of the time with a grant from the American Philosophical Society, has published in this book an excellently edited collection of the early journalistic writings of Valle-Inclán, exhumed from long-forgotten newspapers in Spain and Mexico. The works range from literary criticism to short stories, from political chronicles to original sketches for novels. The searching for that personal style which in the first book, *Femeninas*, appeared to blossom in the desert can now be studied. Fichter draws attention to the deviation from reality in the description of Pablo Iglesias, the socialist leader, whose fair beard and blue eyes become, in a contribution to the Mexican press, "la barba desaliñada, multicolor e hirsuta, verdes las pupilas . . .".

¿Qué mayor prueba. . . , [asks Fichter] de que ya desde sus primeros años de aprendiz de escritor, lo que le interesaba a don Ramón no era pintar la realidad tal y como era, sino dar vuelo a la fantasía para crear algo nuevo y original, aunque para hacerlo tuviera a veces que copiarse a sí mismo, como aquí?

If one did not know of the later development of the *esperpento*, a genre in which reality is deliberately distorted "with the mathematics of a concave mirror," would one not rather suspect him of bad reporting? Perhaps it was so. The Spanish reluctance to verify facts and memories, an unconcern with truth as it is reflected in the physical universe, may be at the bottom of this fictionalizing on the part of Spanish writers in this century. That is why, when Camilo José Cela comes along after the Civil War with a naturalistic novel of a type long unfashionable in the rest of Europe, he strikes Spaniards with the force of a tremendous novelty.

The revelations of these early papers of Valle-Inclán might be summarized as follows: 1) This would-be aristocrat began by taking an interest in workers' movements. 2) He respected and apparently admired the tired old writers of his day: Zorrilla, Galdós, Palacio Valdés, even Echegaray. 3) He was attracted by folklore (the authentic kind, not the theatre "cante flamenco" that passes for such in Spain). 4) The details of his first visit to Mexico can now be reduced to order and credibility; on Valle-Inclán's own testimony this period was important for his career as a writer: "Debo, pues, a México, indirectamente, mi carrera literaria . . . aquí empecé a seguir mi propio camino, es decir, el literario. . . ." 5) Finally—and quite the least important—a newspaper sketch shows that in the Mexican period Valle-Inclán *had no beard*, authorities to the contrary notwithstanding!

There is a good deal of this sort of positivistic research in the book. It is a hard habit for Hispanists to break. But the great blessing positivistic criticism can confer—an excellent text—is there too; surely no other Spanish writer of our day has been so well edited. In spite of the to-do about beards, Fichter's book—both introduction and text—is an immensely valuable contribution to studies on *modernismo* and the Generation of 1898.

BRUCE W. WARDROPPER

The Johns Hopkins University

Geist und Form. Aufsätze zur deutschen Literaturgeschichte von
KARL VIĘTOR. Bern: Francke Verlag, 1952. 381 S. oF. 23.80.

Die zehn Aufsätze, die hier unter dem Titel "Geist und Form" zusammengefaßt erscheinen und bis auf zwei in verschiedenen Zeitschriften über mehr als zwanzig Jahre veröffentlicht waren, sind von Karl Viëtor noch kurz vor seinem Tode für einen solchen Band redigiert und mit einer Einleitung versehen worden. Diese spiegelt in kurzem Überblick seinen eignen Entwicklungsgang in der Germanistik an der Hand der Forschungsströmungen der letzten fünfzig Jahre, von Scherer zur Geistesgeschichte über die Typenlehre Diltheys und Wölfflins, über ästhetische und philosophische Spekulation bis zu einem Ausblick auf eine neue Phase der Literaturgeschichte. In den einzelnen Abhandlungen überrascht es uns, daß schon die frühesten Aufsätze (wie z. B. die glänzende kurze Charakterisierung Grimmelshausens, 1927 in der Frankfurter Zeitung erschienen), die ganze Art seiner Methode und die Kunst seiner Darstellung sowie die Hauptgebiete seines Interesses verraten.

In den vier ersten handelt es sich um eine Neuerfassung und Neuwertung des Barocks; da ist zuerst der Überblick aus dem *Aufriss der Literaturgeschichte* von 1928, dann die Kontrastierung der Barockliteratur in den protestantischen und katholischen Teilen Deutschlands und endlich die Gegenüberstellung von Johannes Scheffler und Christoffel von Grimmelshausen als Vertretern weltanschaulicher Dichtung des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts. Der zweite, klassische Kreis beginnt mit dem hier zum erstenmale veröffentlichten Aufsatz über Goethes Anschauungen vom Menschen, der mit seinen einundsiebzig Seiten im Grunde ein Buch darstellt von Goethischer Anthropologie, dokumentiert aus allen seinen Werken. Der Mensch wird kontrastiert mit dem Tier, über das er hinausgeht dadurch, daß er seine Organe beherrscht, während das Tier von ihnen tyrannisiert wird, daß er die größte Mannigfaltigkeit seines Organismus zentralisiert und unendlich anpassungsfähig ist. Im Gegensatz zur mechanistischen Lehre Darwins bewirken Geist und

Materie in ihm eine "innere Kausalität," dem Kunstwerk ähnlich, das er zu schaffen fähig ist. Seine Grundeigenschaft ist eine unendliche Tätigkeit und er vermag die Natur durch Totalität zur Freiheit heraufzuheben.

Viëtor diskutiert dann die drei Entwicklungsphasen, die er in Goethes Einstellung zur Willensfreiheit findet, die frühe naturalistische, die eigentlich humanistische, in der er sich Kant nähert, und die letzte eines "inneren Determinismus." Da ihm nicht nur das Böse sondern auch das Gute angeboren und er sich seiner "geeinten Zwienatur" bewußt ist, muß es seine Aufgabe sein, diese zu harmonisieren nach der bekannten Goethischen Spiralbewegung, *semper sursum revertor*. Ebenso gilt es, die Mitte zwischen der Individualität und den Forderungen der Gesellschaft zu treffen. "Der Aufstieg zur Gattung wird sich aus dem Aufstieg der produktiven Individuen ergeben, ohne daß der Fortschritt unmittelbar zum Gegenstand und Ziel des Strebens gemacht wird." Der frühe Schicksalsglaube des jungen Goethe aber wird zu einer Schicksalströmmigkeit. Indessen kann er auf keine Weise das Morgen bereiten, als dadurch dass er die Forderung des Heute erfüllt.

Mit kluger Hand ist der schöne Aufsatz über Goethes Altersgedichte dieser allgemeineren und umfassenderen Betrachtung nachgestellt, obwohl er gegen zwanzig Jahre früher geschrieben ist. Er weist den großen Wert der *Farbenlehre* für Goethes Dichtung nach und erklärt Goethes verhältnismäßig geringen Sinn für Farbe aus seiner stetigen Suche nach der Gesetzmäßigkeit in der Welt, für die das Verhältnis von Licht und Dunkel wichtiger ist. Besonders in Goethes Altersdichtung werden die Farben zu reinen Symbolwerten. Von Naturerkennnis handelt dann auch der Aufsatz über die "Terzinen auf Schillers Schädel," "Die Idee des Erhabenen" leitet sodann über zu einer Interpretation von Hölderlins Liebeslegie.

Das problematische Thema der "Geschichte literarischer Gattungen" (1931) des letzten Aufsatzes hatte Vietor in seiner *Geschichte der deutschen Ode* bereits 1923 in Angriff genommen als Herausgeber einer Buchserie, die zu seiner großen Enttäuschung mit Günther Müllers *Geschichte des deutschen Liedes* (1925) schon zu einem Ende kam aus Mangel an Enthusiasmus der Fachgenossen für dieses wichtige Feld.

Man wird das letzte Buch Vietors nicht aus der Hand legen ohne das Gefühl des schmerzlichen Verlustes, den die Germanistik durch seinen frühen Tod erlitten hat.

ERNST FEISE

BRIEF MENTION

Vokalismen i Iddemålet. By REIDAR MYHRE. Oslo, Jacob Dybwad, 1952. Pp. iv, 118. (Skrifter fra norsk mālförearkiv ved Sigurd Kolsrud I.) This is a thorough description of the dialect of a region in the extreme southeast corner of Norway, right on the Swedish border. It falls into five chapters: an introduction, dealing with the history and topography of the region (Idd herred) and the relationship of its speech to the dialects of the vicinity. The second chapter gives a survey of the phonetics of the dialect, the third deals in great detail with the quantity of vowels, and the fourth also in great detail with their quality. The fifth chapter gives specimens of the dialect in phonetic transcription, and the book is completed by a bibliography and a glossary of words treated. There is no display of modern phonological method of contrasts not even in the phonetic survey, but comparison with other dialects and with Old Norse are frequent. What the author sets out to do is obviously well and thoroughly carried out. The book makes the first volume in a series to be published by the Archives of the Norwegian Dialects, directed by Professor Sigurd Kolsrud.

Johns Hopkins University

STEFÁN EINARSSON

Mary Wollstonecraft: A Critical Biography. By RALPH M. WARDLE. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1951. Pp. 366. \$4.50. Mr. Wardle's critical study of the life and works of Mary Wollstonecraft makes a distinct contribution to our knowledge of an important eighteenth-century figure. Mary Wollstonecraft's interesting and moving story is told with authenticity and impartiality. If Mr. Wardle's impatience with Mary's early attitudes and his detached and considerably less than sympathetic presentation of her long struggle to regain Imlay's love reduce the dramatic intensity of her story, they compensate for this loss by the confidence they inspire in the reader that the facts are not being manipulated in the interest of apology or sentiment. The analysis of her works is similarly refreshing in its impartial acknowledgment of strength and weakness. It is unfortunate that factual fidelity and balanced judgment are so often accompanied, as here, by pedestrianism of style. They need not be: witness the fine literary quality of some of our recent scholarly biographies. The book reflects significantly the changing temper of the times in its clear differentiation of the successive stages of Mary's intellectual development:

her period of sensibility; her robuster years of revolutionary thought; and—what has been less noticed—the final repudiation of the extreme rationalist position and the reassertion of the importance of the imagination and emotions, a reassertion which allies her with the young romantics of the end of the century. Perhaps Mr. Wardle's greatest contribution is his inclusion of much fresh material from Lord Abinger's collection of letters of Mary Wollstonecraft, of her sister Elizabeth W. Bishop, and of William Godwin. Only a small portion of these letters had been published by Charles Kegan Paul in his *William Godwin: His Friends and Contemporaries*, 1876. Through these letters Mr. Wardle has been able to do much the same service in correcting the inaccuracies in the work of Kegan Paul and others that W. Clark Durant had previously done for Godwin's *Memoirs of the Author of 'A Vindication of the Rights of Woman.'* He has also made a more thorough study of Mary's contribution to the contemporary reviews than other writers, adding to the probable canon of her works. Because of these added titles and because of the very sparse reference in the text and notes to previous studies of Mary Wollstonecraft, a bibliography would have been a useful addition to the book.

Russell Sage College

LOIS WHITNEY

Voltaire. Lettres inédites à son imprimeur Gabriel Cramer, publiées par BERNARD GAGNEBIN. Geneva: Droz, 1952. Pp. xliv + 317. Published here are 342 letters out of more than 1000 that M. Gagnebin has located. He indicates briefly the relations of the Cramers with Voltaire, whose chief publishers they were for some years. Most of the letters have not been published before. They contain many complaints from Voltaire over typographical errors, one of which turned *anglais* into *tiran* (p. 224), various requests for books, directions as to the disposition of his own works. Occasionally there is criticism. The fault with *Phèdre* is not the "récit de Théramène," but "le sot rôle du coeu" (p. 218). Shakespeare was fortunate in having as editors and critics "Pope, le meilleur poète de son temps, et l'évêque Warburton, le plus savant et le plus éclairé" (p. 63). The edition seems to have been carefully made except that the index is incomplete and that there are a few errors that could easily have been corrected: add *eruption* after *fiery* (p. 19, n. 1, line 6); "l'enlèvement de Clarice" (p. 66) must refer, not, as M. Gagnebin indicates, to *le Menteur*, in which Clarice is not abducted, but to *la Veuve*, in which she is; Voltaire is stating emphatically that Corneille's early plays are to be put at the end of the collection; "Voltaire cite des vers de Diamante que Corneille a imités dans le *Cid*," (p. 244), but Diamante's play of 1658, once supposed to be a source of *le Cid*, is really an adaptation of it, so that the imitator was not Corneille, but Diamante.

H. C. LANCASTER

BOOKS RECEIVED

ENGLISH

Allen, Don Cameron.—The Harmonious Vision: Studies in Milton's Poetry. *Baltimore:* The Johns Hopkins Press, 1954. Pp. xx + 125. \$3.00.

Broughton, L. N., Northup, C. S., Pearsall, R.—Robert Browning: a Bibliography, 1830-1950. *Ithaca, N. Y.:* Cornell Univ. Press, 1953. Pp. xiv + 446. \$7.75. (Cornell Studies in English, 39.)

Chester, Allan G.—Hugh Latimer, Apostle to the English. *Philadelphia:* Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1954. Pp. x + 261. \$6.00.

Essays by Divers Hands.—Ed. by Joseph Bard. *New York:* Oxford Univ. Press, 1953. Pp. x + 159. \$2.20. (Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, N. S. 26.)

Gelling, Margaret, and Stenton, D. M.—The Place-Names of Oxfordshire, Part I. *New York:* Cambridge Univ. Press, 1953. Pp. liii + 244. \$5.50. (English Place-Name Society, 23.)

Jackson, Kenneth.—Language and History in Early Britain. *Cambridge, Mass.:* Harvard Univ. Press, 1953. Pp. xxvi + 752. \$12.50.

Lowers, James K.—Mirrors for Rebels: a Study of Polemical Literature Relating to the Northern Rebellion. *Berkeley and Los Angeles:* Univ. of California Press, 1953. Pp. vi + 130. \$2.00.

Morris, David.—The Poetry of Gerard Manley Hopkins and T. S. Eliot in the Light of the Donne Tradition. *Bern:* A. Francke, 1953. Pp. 144. (Swiss Studies in English, 33.)

O'Connor, William V.—The Tangled Fire of William Faulkner. *Minneapolis:* Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1954. Pp. xv + 182. \$4.00. Text ed., \$3.00.

Secchi, Nicolo.—Self-Interest. Tr. by William Reymes. Ed. by Helen A. Kaufman. *Seattle:* Univ. of Washington Press, 1953. Pp. xxix + 106. \$2.00.

Shakespeare, William.—Richard III. Ed. by J. D. Wilson. *New York:* Cambridge Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. lxiii + 280. \$2.75. (New Shakespeare Series.)

Taylor, Archer.—Proverbial Comparisons and Similes from California. *Berkeley and Los Angeles:* Univ. of California Press, 1954. Pp. 97. \$1.50. (Univ. of Calif. Pubs., Folklore Studies, 3.)

University of Texas.—Studies in English, vol. 32 for 1953. *Austin, Texas:* Univ. of Texas Press, 1953. Pp. 162.

GERMAN

Deutsche Liederdichter des 13. Jahrhunderts. Hrg. v. Carl von Kraus. Bd. 2, 6. Lieferung, besorgt v. H. Kuhn. *Tübingen:* Max Niemeyer, 1954. 154-288 pp. DM 15.-

Helm, Karl.—Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte, 2. Band: Die nachrömische Zeit. 2 Teil: Die Westgermanen [Germanische Bibliothek 5. Reihe]. *Heidelberg:* Carl Winter, 1953. 292 pp.

Kraus, Carl v. (ed.).—Minnesang des 13. Jahrhunderts. Aus C. v. Kraus' 'Deutschen Liederdichtern' ausgew. v. H. Kuhn, m. Übertragung d. Melodien v. Gg. Reichert. *Tübingen:* Max Niemeyer, 1953. xi, 160 pp. DM. 5.80.

Schnitzler, Arthur — Brahm, Otto.—Der Briefwechsel Schnitzler — Brahm, hrsg. u. eingel. v. Oskar Seidlin [Schriften d. Gesellschaft f. Theatergesch. Bd. 57]. *Berlin:* Selbstverlag, Ges. f. Theatergesch., 1953. 266 pp.

Stammler, Wolfgang.—Kleine Schriften zur Literaturgeschichte d. Mittelalters. *Berlin:* Erich Schmidt, 1953. viii + 269 pp.

Wittman, Nora E.—Brief German Reference Grammar. *New York:* American Book Company, 1954. viii + 88 pp. \$1.05.

Wyder, Hans-Uli.—Gottlieb W. Rabener, Poetische Welt und Realität. *Zürich:* Rüegg & Co., 1953. 132 pp.

FRENCH

Bray, René.—Molière: Homme de théâtre. *Paris:* Mercure de France, 1954.

Flaubert, Gustave.—Correspondance Supplément (1830-1863). Ed. by R. Dumesnil, J. Pommier, C. Digeon. *Paris:* Louis Conard, 1954. Pp. xii + 343. (Œuvres Complètes de Gustave Flaubert.)

— Correspondance Supplément (1864-1871). Pp. 319.

— Correspondance Supplément (1872-1877). Pp. 365.

— Correspondance Supplément (1877-1880). Pp. 362.

Hallowell, Robert E.—Ronsard and the Conventional Roman Elegy. *Urbana*: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1954. Pp. 176.

Tinsley, Sister Lucy.—The French Expressions for Spirituality and Devotion: a Semantic Study. *Washington, D. C.*: Catholic Univ. of America Press, 1953. Pp. xxvii + 302. (Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures, 47.)

ITALIAN

Barbi, Michele.—Life of Dante (tr. and ed. Paul G. Ruggiers). *Berkeley* and *Los Angeles*: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1954. Pp. i + 132.

GENERAL

Wais, Kurt.—Die Lieder um Krimhild, Brünhild, Dietrich und ihre frühen ausserdeutschen Beziehungen = Vol. I of Frühe Epik Westeuropas u. d. Vorgeschichte d. Nibelungenliedes. M. e. Beitrag v. Hugo Kuhr: Brunhild u. d. Krimhildlied [Beihefte z. ZfRPh. Heft 95]. *Tübingen*: Max Niemeyer, 1953. 211 pp. DM 18.60.

1954

nd ed.
s An-
Pp. x

mild,
usser-
Frühe
nte d.
Hugo
[Bei-
Max

and ed.
Los An-
Pp. 1

rimhild
ausser
Frühe
ichte d.
. Hugo
d [Bei-
: Mar
0.

Princeton — UNIVERSITY PRESS

and ed.
Los An-
P. I.

rimhild,
ausser-
Frühe
chte d.
Hugo
d [Bei-
: Mar
0.

CHAUCERIAN ESSAYS

By GORDON HALL GEROULD. These six essays consider such subjects as the many references to saints in Chaucer's works, some dominant ideas of the Wife of Bath, the essentially serious nature of Chaucer, and the extent of his limitations as artist.

Mr. Gerould, who writes from years of familiar association with Chaucer's poetry and scholarly reflection on its problems, is Holmes professor of belles-lettres, emeritus, at Princeton.

\$2.00

TWENTIETH CENTURY GERMAN VERSE

Translated by HERMAN SALINGER. This little anthology does not pretend to be a grand tour of German poetry in our century. It is, however, a charming selection of about forty poems from the writings of such representative poets as Rilke, George, and Hofmannsthal and, more recently, Weinheber, Haushofer, and Holthusen.

Within a small compass Mr. Salinger has been able to achieve great variety in both subject matter and poetic stature. He is professor of modern foreign languages at Grinnell College, Iowa, where he teaches German and comparative literature.

120 pages, \$2.50

MIMESIS

By ERICH AUERBACH. Translated from the German by Willard R. Trask. This book reaches back through two thousand years of Western literature to discover how the writer from age to age has solved the most intriguing problem of his craft—the serious portrayal of everyday reality. By an analysis of key passages in 20 writers from Homer to Virginia Woolf, Erich Auerbach traces the revolutions of thought and taste that have determined the changes in our concept of realism. One of the classics of our time in the field of humanistic studies.

520 pages, \$7.50



Order from your bookstore, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS



New readers for intermediate French classes

SIMENON'S

Le Client le plus obstiné du monde

Edited by I. D. McIntosh. An intriguing detective story written by its famous author expressly for the classroom. Illustrated. Ready this spring

LEDÉSERT, LEDÉSERT & SMITH La France

Gives an excellent picture of French life under the following topics: The Country of France; History; Institutions; The Family; Arts and Sciences; Overseas France. Illustrated. Ready this spring

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Announcing the new line of **MCKAY'S MODERN** **Foreign-Language** **DICTIONARIES**

These new, completely up-to-date dictionaries are the result of continued and careful research into the linguistic needs of today's student, business man, traveler and general reader. They are practical, geared to the requirements of *today*; obsolete and uncommon terms have been scrapped. They combine authority with legibility of type and handiness of format, and they are bound to stand years of use. In every way they are the best value in the foreign-language dictionary field.

NOW READY: German, \$2.50; Italian, \$3.50; Swedish, \$3.50
COMING: Spanish, \$3.50.

Examination copies sent on approval to
accredited teachers of languages. Write to

DAVID MCKAY COMPANY, INC. 35 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 3